UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

- - - - -

NUCLEAR INFRASTRUCTURE

PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

- - - - -

SCOPING MEETING

- - - - -

MONDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1999

- - - - -

The meeting was held in the Rainier Room
at the Seattle Center, 305 Harrison Street,
Seattle, Washington, at 7:00 p.m.

PRESENT:

JIM PARHAM, Facilitator

U.S. Department of Energy (DOE Headquarters)

COLETTE BROWN, PEIS Project Manager,
Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology
SHANE JOHNSON, Program Manager
RAJ SHARMA, NEPA Compliance Officer
EARL WAHLQUIST
CHRIS KARIS

U.S. Department of Energy (Richland, WA, Operations)

DOUG CHAPIN
AL FARABEE
GAIL McCLURE

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

Table of Contents

Table of Contents (Continued):

Formal Comment Session:

Exhibits:

Table of Contents (Concluded):

Exhibits:

P R O C E E D I N G S

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you for coming out this evening and taking time from your day to be here.

Welcome to this Department of Energy's Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement meeting. And that's for Accomplishing the Expanded Civilian Nuclear Energy Research and Development and Isotope Production Mission in the U.S., including the Role of the Fast Flux Test Facility. This programmatic environmental impact statement is referred to also as the Nuclear Infrastructure PEIS, which I assume would be a title that will be used this evening more than the other one, since it would put us even later in the evening to continue that.

I'm Jim Parham; I'm your facilitator tonight. I'm not an employee of the Department of Energy, nor a representative of DOE. I've been asked to facilitate this meeting in an open and impartial manner. Just so you know who I am, and that is the fact that I used to be out here managing your parks here in Washington state when I was with the National Parks Service. And currently I am a professor at Indiana University, and that's what I do, and I have no opinions about this one way or the other.

My job is to serve this evening, to get through a lot of people here who want to talk, and I'm going to be very, very pointed about staying fair and impartial in moving forward in a very, very concise as well as fair fashion. It's very important. And I used to be out here. When I was out here, I used to have the opportunity to run the Spotted Owl hearings and the Wolverine Reintroduction hearings, so I've seen and heard it all. And I'm not going to really expect that kind of problem here, because it's really a good opportunity to talk here among a group about what's going on. Again, my job is two-fold: I'm here to ensure that you're at least satisfied, knowing that — or that you feel satisfied that DOE has given a view of what their proposed action is, analyzed in this PEIS, answered your questions to the extent practicable, and had an opportunity to give your comments on the scope of this PEIS in this meeting.

I would ask that you help me do this by making sure everyone has a chance to comment and be heard, just like you want. What this means is extending the same courtesy to each speaker and commenter as you'll want to receive during your comments.

This is the one in a series — this is one in a series of seven scoping meetings to be held, and there's been meetings already held in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, Idaho Falls, of course Seattle. We move on to Portland, Hood River, Richland, and finally Washington, D.C.

The comment period began on September 15th, 1999, and runs through October 31st, 1999. Let me repeat that: the closing date for the comment period is October 31st, 1999. Comments received after that date will be considered to the extent practicable.

These hearings are just one way that you can provide comments to DOE on the proposed action to be addressed in the PEIS. You may also send written comments to DOE, address listed in your packet. There's also opportunity — DOE has a lot of avenues. They have a fax, they have e-mail, they have voice mail, so that's all in your packet about how to get a hold of them before the end of the comment period. So hopefully, you'll be able to do that.

When you registered tonight, or if you didn't register, you just came on in, you may have and should have received a package of materials

that include a comment form. We'd like to get your comments on the format. I've heard several people comment about the format already. And we are trying to do this and make it better every time. Oral and written comments are given equal consideration by the Department.

When you came in, there was a session — a handout on rules of the meeting, and I think that's self-explanatory. The way we're going to run the meeting, let me just go through the format, is that right now I'll close up in a couple of seconds, we'll have a DOE representative give you a presentation on -- about a thirty-minute presentation, an overview of this, what's being considered here, and then we'll go to a question and answer session on that presentation for a few minutes, and then, I would say probably by less than an hour from now, whatever, we get into the comments session. And that is for you to come up to the microphone. And I'm going to ask for a show of hands, and pick people randomly. There's no sign-up sheet. I don't know who you are and you don't know much about me, but I do know that we can be impartial and just pick people as you want to come up and comment at the microphone.

The best way to do that is, and really the way I prefer to do, is to — we'll start and go to this microphone, I'll ask -- call on somebody with their hand up to come to this microphone, then we'll come to this one, and just back and forth. Don't stand up in a long line. If you want to — 'cause we'll get to you, I guarantee you. We're going to be here and make sure that you get a chance to comment.

The rules of the meeting also included that the individuals have five minutes and representatives of organizations have ten minutes. That means if you're representing a specific group that you would have the ten-minute time period. That's stated in the NOI. Also, we'll take elected officials first and representatives of elected officials first. We'll get to that in a minute.

There's a lot of materials available back there. As I walked around, I saw that the expert panel report, "Forecast of Future Demand for Medical Isotopes," the Federal Register Notice of Intent, and several NASA brochures and other items are back there from the DOE folks.

Ms. Colette Brown from the Department of Energy's Office of Nuclear Energy is here tonight

to present an overview of the NEPA process and to give a brief presentation on the programmatic environmental impact statement. Ms. Brown is the person at the Department in charge of managing the preparation of the programmatic environmental impact statement.

I will do some other introductions in a minute, though I would like to say that as we go through the evening, I'm sure we'll need to take a five-minute break now and then, and we'll do that as time looks like, and I'll make those calls and check in with you. I would like to ask up front, how many people currently plan on — I know you haven't heard the presentation. How many people currently plan on providing comments at the microphone tonight during the comment session?

Okay. So you can tell we're going to be here for a while, with that kind of numbers. We're going to try to hear everybody. And the fact is, with that many folks, I know you'll recognize that we'll want to keep it to a level that won't keep us here too late into the evening. I think there is a time that the building closes down. Charlotte, I don't know if that's later on, but I'm sure it's — we'll have some time, and we'll find

out when that is at a break, because there's a good number of people who want to comment.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: May I ask a question about procedure?

THE FACILITATOR: Sure.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Since we're going over the procedure and we have so many to testify, I'm wondering, because I suspect some of us have heard the DOE testimony before and we have given a lot before, perhaps this could be scrunched down to fifteen minutes, and then we would have more opportunity to — because we do have a big packet of information.

THE FACILITATOR: Well, I'll ask DOE to —

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: — to move right along in the presentation, so we'll see how we can get there. I know that the presentation needs to be consistent at all sites. And we'll take that under advisement.

Yes, sir, a question on format?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Please. In terms of fairness, the Department of Energy is going to give thirty minutes. I didn't hear you say the

alternative viewpoint is going to have thirty minutes, so I was going to —

THE FACILITATOR: No, you didn't hear me say that. What you heard me say is, everybody — individuals have five minutes, and group representing — someone representing an organization has ten.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: But I know that there's some excellent speakers here representing some of the best Hanford Watch groups and the Physicians for Social Responsibility. For me to make an informed decision, I would like to hear the Department of Energy's presentation as well as the citizens' presentation, and then I can make my comment.

THE FACILITATOR: Yeah. Well, thank you. I'm sure we'll hear everybody's presentation this evening.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I don't understand. Are you saying “Yes,” it's fair we're going to have fifteen minutes of Department of Energy and fifteen minutes —?

THE FACILITATOR: No, what I said was, I'm sure we're going to have everybody's opinion tonight, so —

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I know what you said, but you said earlier about fairness. Now, this is a public hearing.

THE FACILITATOR: Right.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: And I want a Department of Energy thing and a -- and the alternative.

THE FACILITATOR: Yeah. Let me —

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, what's the deal? Is that fair?

THE FACILITATOR: Would you let me explain this?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Sure.

THE FACILITATOR: And I'll ask you to take a seat, because we're ready to move forward.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'll sit when you explain it to me.

THE FACILITATOR: What the answer is, is DOE will give a brief presentation, and we'll follow that with an opportunity to ask questions on their presentation, and then we'll follow that with a public comment session that will go with five minutes for individuals and ten minutes for representatives of organizations; but first, the elected officials will go before that, and then

we'll just continue on until whatever time everyone's been done. Okay?

GERALD POLLET: How many people would like it to be a —

THE FACILITATOR: Gerry —

GERALD POLLET: — DOE presentation rather than have the [*indiscernible*] —

THE FACILITATOR: We're not taking a vote on that.

GERALD POLLET: -- now be a DOE presentation —

THE FACILITATOR: No, we're not taking a vote on this, Gerry.

GERALD POLLET: — and —

THE FACILITATOR: Shut off the mike. Shut off the mike.

GERALD POLLET: — and then if the Department of Energy wants to have fifteen minutes, under the Hanford [*indiscernible*], most of you are familiar with the protocol that says there must be an alternative point of view so that you can proffer informed testimony.

THE FACILITATOR: Are we done yet?

GERALD POLLET: Leaving it to the DOE's hand-picked handmaiden to pick and choose who

gets to go when, means that you don't get the benefit of hearing someone who might have actually discovered that tank leaks from high-level nuclear waste tanks —

THE FACILITATOR: Gerry, should I — Gerry, should I count this as part of your time that you're going to be talking?

GERALD POLLET: You know what? Why don't you just agree that people here would like to have —

THE FACILITATOR: I don't agree to —

GERALD POLLET: — alternative points of view —

THE FACILITATOR: I haven't heard that, Gerry. Would you — would you take a seat?

GERALD POLLET: -- and have them stand up if they'd like to hear an alternative point of view.

THE FACILITATOR: Doesn't seem -- okay, so there's some people; fine. Gerry, I'm going to tell you —

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah, funny thing: we live in a democracy, and we're supposed to have fairness.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: We want fairness; we want democracy.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Fairness was the word you used —

THE FACILITATOR: Sorry.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: — about fifteen minutes ago —

GERALD POLLET: You also said briefly the DOE —

AUDIENCE MEMBER: -- and now it's "Sorry, we can't be fair."

THE FACILITATOR: You want DOE — I heard someone say they wanted DOE to go briefly, and get into the comments session. We're just now wasting time here. Are we going to move forward or not? This is the format we're going to follow. Please have a seat.

GERALD POLLET: If you want public comments, if what you do —

THE FACILITATOR: You're just taking time away from equal — let's go.

GERALD POLLET: — is that you decide that people cannot hear from other —

THE FACILITATOR: Did I say that, Gerry?

GERALD POLLET: Yes, you did, because you've said you're going to hand-pick who gets to go where.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: You people are all keeping me from being able to make —

GERALD POLLET: Good.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: — my comments.

THE FACILITATOR: Gerry, you are talking -- you know what? You're just being as unfair as what you're describing here. Would you please take a seat?

GERALD POLLET: No, we're not. We expect the same format to be followed as is followed at every other Hanford Cleanup meeting.

THE FACILITATOR: This is not a Hanford Cleanup meeting. This is —

GERALD POLLET: I know you don't want to talk about —

THE FACILITATOR: — a programmatic EIS.

GERALD POLLET: — Hanford Cleanup here, but —

THE FACILITATOR: This is not — I'm telling you, Gerry —

GERALD POLLET: — why don't you just

agree that the problem —

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Democracy.

THE FACILITATOR: It is democracy; I'd like to get on with democracy, if we could.

GERALD POLLET: You offered an alternative, which was, when you —

THE FACILITATOR: That's not the alternative we're following.

GERALD POLLET: You just said you wanted to hear public comment from —

AUDIENCE MEMBER: You're not on mike.

GERALD POLLET: -- two or three public interest groups so that you can offer informed comments on behalf the public.

THE FACILITATOR: We're ready to get started. Would you please have a seat?

GERALD POLLET: I do expect that this is in the record. I demand that this be in the record. You're not in the record? This is outrageous and a breach of your own regulations that you're not recording this.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Mr. Pollet, I want an orderly meeting. Please sit down.

GERALD POLLET: When the Department

of Energy —

THE FACILITATOR: Gerry, would you please have a seat? We're trying to get through the rules of the road here.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: You can put it in your ten minutes, because I have something to say, too.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay, Gerry, please have a seat. Would you, please?

GERALD POLLET: I have people here who just want to have, once more —

THE FACILITATOR: Well, I'll tell you what we're going to do, Gerry, because —

We're going to take a five-minute break here, folks, because I can't get started. Why don't you guys talk amongst yourself. But here's the format; that's the way we're going. You're wasting our time here. If we don't get started, you are inconveniencing a lot of people here who probably have babysitters and everything else going on, and it's really an atrocity that you do that. Please sit down and let's get started, or whatever.

GERALD POLLET: -- the DOE's own protocol —

THE FACILITATOR: We're taking a

break. Thank you. Break.

(Recess, 7:13 p.m. until 7:15 p.m.)

THE FACILITATOR: I'm going to get started. We'll have a presentation. I would like for you to hold your questions till the end of the presentation. If we can't get back on track here, we'll just take another recess, and we'll just keep going until we can have a sensible session here. Okay? We're wasting people's time, and I'm not going to have it. Okay? Trust me, I —

AUDIENCE MEMBER: We're supposed to be doing exactly what you say, and not doing what the majority says?

THE FACILITATOR: Sir, I'm going with the way that's fair to everybody here, so we're going to go ahead and get started.

Yes?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I have a procedural question.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: My procedural question says that any persons exhibiting behavior that's disruptive to the meeting will be asked to leave immediately. And we've had a couple of classic examples of disruption. I'd like to hear

what's going to be presented. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: All right. Thank you. Okay. Thank you; I agree with that. And we're going to get started, okay? So let's get moving.

I would like to now turn the microphone over to Colette Brown who will give a DOE presentation.

Also, in the audience we have in the front row, and I'd like for you to stand and be recognized:

Shane Johnson, Special Assistant to the Director, Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology, and is responsible for a lot of this work.

Also, we have Doug Chapin, physical scientist, FFTF.

We have Raj Sharma; I think Raj is a NEPA expert.

Al Farabee, someplace there; Al is the Acting FFTF Director, Project Office.

Chris Karis. Is that right?

MR. CHRIS KARIS: Karis.

THE FACILITATOR: Yeah; thank you — Office of Nuclear Energy and Isotopes Program.

And who am I missing? Anybody at this point? No? Okay.

Colette, would you like to take the stage?

MS. COLETTE BROWN: I don't know.

THE FACILITATOR: You don't know. Okay [*laughing*].

MS. COLETTE BROWN: Thanks, Jim. I had scheduled this to be a half-hour presentation; but, I will shorten it as much as I can, try to make it about fifteen minutes, so we can get right into the meeting and make up for the lost time.

(Presentation by Ms. Colette Brown was given)

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you, ma'am.

Colette, if you'd take a seat over there? Shane, could we have you come up to the table, too, and we'll take some —

Given the interest in keeping this brief, we'll keep the Q&A session to about ten minutes, and then we'll move right into the comment period, if that's okay with everyone, so —

QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

THE FACILITATOR: Yes, sir. Could you come to the microphone and ask your question?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you. My question is, “Will the draft EIS contain a preferred alternative, or are you going to hold off until the final? When — *i.e.*, when will you state what your preferred alternative is?”

MS. COLETTE BROWN: We will not have a preferred alternative identified in the draft; we will hold off until the final.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thanks. Any questions, additional questions here? Yes?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I've got actually a couple of questions. The elements of the decision-making process, what weight is given to each of these different elements? For example, it mentions cost as one of the elements of the decision-making process, and I'd hate to see that cost would be a deciding factor in the degree of risk that might be involved in these different alternatives. So I'm wondering, first off, what weight is given to those different elements?

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Good. Thank you.

MS. COLETTE BROWN: We don't have prescribed weighting factors for each of those elements. That is a call that is made by the Secretary of Energy, and each alternative — you know, its environmental impact, its cost, its technical maturity, its scheduled implementation, is viewed as a package. But there's no prescribed weight, weighting factor assigned to each of those.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. You have another question, sir?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yes. The mention of what the missions do not — does not include, such as the production of tritium and nuclear weapons material, et cetera, is there any guarantee that that will never be used if this — one of these alternatives that creates that possibility is chosen? I mean, how do we know that it won't lead to something like that if —

THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: — an alternative is chosen that creates that possibility down the line?

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you. We'll probably move over to another question now, so we'll limit you to two now, and we'll go over here. So go ahead.

MS. COLETTE BROWN: Well, this NEPA action involves possibly restarting this facility for the missions I talked about. Should there be a decision ten years, fifteen years, or sooner than that to upgrade the facility for a different mission, that would require separate NEPA action. So I mean, there are — the short answer is, there are no guarantees in life to anything, but I'm not talking about — I am not talking about proposing to restart this facility for anything defense-related.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you; appreciate it.

Hands over here; I want to move to this side now, questions from this side of the room. Are there any? No questions? Yes, ma'am.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I notice under the No Action Alternative, that you say that FFTF would be maintained in a standby mode.

MS. COLETTE BROWN: Yes.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Why would it not be made to comply with the Tri-Party Agreement and shut down at that point, instead of having it in standby mode as a no action?

MS. COLETTE BROWN: Shane, do you want to take that?

THE FACILITATOR: Shane?

MR. SHANE JOHNSON: Yeah, I guess the short answer is, excuse me, that —

THE FACILITATOR: Shane, why don't you identify yourself, make sure everyone knows —

MR. SHANE JOHNSON: Yes. My name is Shane Johnson; I work in the Office of Nuclear Energy. And the short answer to your question is, the No Action Alternative is what the name says; the Department takes no action one way or the other in changing its facilities. That is not to say that, should the decision-maker choose to go with the No Action Alternative, that would not limit the decision-maker from then making a subsequent decision to go with deactivation of the FFTF.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Okay, let's take a few more questions, then we can move on. Yes. Yes, ma'am?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Because of the problems in Los Alamos, there was a good deal of discussion in Washington, D.C. about reorganizing the facilities, the facilities at the -- at Los Alamos and others, and reorganizing the Department.

If that occurred, what would that do to these plans? Would we go through new EISs and new hearings, or would this just be slopped over into a new organization, or what?

MS. COLETTE BROWN: A departmental — departmental reorganization, in terms of alignments of facilities, you know, and the departmental element responsible for that facility, would not be part of this, of this EIS. That would happen —

MR. SHANE JOHNSON: Are you referring to the new Nuclear Security Administration?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Yeah. Yeah.

MR. SHANE JOHNSON: Okay.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: And what would — what would that do to these things? Could they just — since it involves the various facilities —

MR. SHANE JOHNSON: Right.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: — would they just forget about this and do what they want, or what?

MR. SHANE JOHNSON: Well, that reorganization with the Department is really focused on our defense-related facilities, the defense labs, the FFTF and the High Flux Isotope Reactor, the —

MS. COLETTE BROWN: ATR.

MR. SHANE JOHNSON: — Advanced Test Reactor in Idaho would not be part of that. They would remain within the Civilian Program Offices at the Department.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you.

We'll take -- let's take one more question. Yes, sir; how about here in the white? Yes.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I heard you say that the isotopes will not be used for any military action or —

MS. COLETTE BROWN: That's correct.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay. Can you tell us how much — what percentage of the isotopes are going to be used for medical technology and what percentage are going to be used for other programs such as NASA?

MS. COLETTE BROWN: Well, all of the medical — I'm separating the medical isotopes from the Pu-238 used for NASA. We're talking about making up the 5 kilograms per year of plutonium-238 to serve NASA's needs, but it's a separate isotope reduction mission from the medical isotopes.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay. How important is the medical isotope mission versus the NASA mission?

MS. COLETTE BROWN: There's no relative priority given to each.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Okay. Thank you.

MS. COLETTE BROWN: You're welcome.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

Yeah, let's take one more question, then we'll move over to the comment period. Yes, ma'am?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm wondering how much consideration is going to be given to the amount of waste produced by each alternative, and how that will impact the already inadequate cleanup that's going on at Hanford.

MS. COLETTE BROWN: The last part of your question, please?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: And how that will — that will impact the already inadequate cleanup that's happening a Hanford.

MS. COLETTE BROWN: Okay. The amount of waste generated by each alternative is a big part of the EIS, and those waste streams will be characterized and their disposition pathways will be identified in the EIS. As far as cleanup of the site goes, cleanup is — will continue at existing levels, and would not be diminished by restart of the facility.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Thanks, Colette.

Let's move — go ahead and move to the comment period now, and then we can get started. As I said before, we would — and there's several people came in later to the — to the presentation. I did want to mention what we've done. We've had a brief presentation by DOE and taken a few questions on that, and now with — the show of hands earlier demonstrates a lot of people want to comment during this period of time. Also, Chris over here has got my — will keep our watch going for us, so — and he'll give me the one-minute high sign, and that means that you -- and I'll just, not rudely interrupt you, but I'll sort of get your attention that you've got a minute left. For representatives of organizations there's ten minutes, for elected officials we have ten minutes set aside, and then the individuals, five minutes. And that was the way the NOI came out. We'd like to go ahead and get started, if we could. I believe the first person — there's a — Senator Slade Gorton's office has a representative here. Yes, sir.

MR. LEON SWENSON: Yes; thank you

very much. I have a prepared statement from United States Senator Slade Gorton for this Nuclear Infrastructure Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement.

THE FACILITATOR: Please, let's — could we hear — could we listen? Thank you.

Please go ahead, sir.

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF SENATOR SLADE GORTON

MR. LEON SWENSON: Thank you.

"Cardiovascular disease is the number one killer in America. Cancer affects one in three people in the United States. Arthritis and rheumatic conditions affect 43 million Americans. These are daunting statistics, statistics that are represented by real people and their suffering. Medical isotopes are used in new, cutting-edge technologies in treating cancer and other diseases without the usual debilitating side effects, and at a lower cost than traditional treatments. 'Smart bullets' with medical isotopes have achieved up to 95 percent success in treating certain cancers. However, our nation is facing documented shortages of research and treatment quantities of isotopes because we lack adequate production capabilities. We lack enough facilities to produce the variety,

quantity, and quality of lifesaving isotopes that are necessary to conduct research and to treat our patients. In this scoping meeting for the Nuclear Infrastructure Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement, I urge the Department of Energy to consider, first and foremost, the commitment the Federal government is required to keep under Section 31 of the Atomic Energy Act, *to wit*: to supply research and production quantities of isotopes.

"Isotopes are made and used in various ways from nuclear waste as in yttrium-90, which has been found very effective in treating non-Hodgkin's lymphoma; accelerator produced isotopes, such as fluorine-18, used in diagnostic tests like P-E-T scans; and reactor-produced isotopes such as iridium-192, which is used to help prevent arteries from reclogging following angioplasty. In assessing our nation's needs, all methods of isotope production to produce a reliable, diverse supply for researchers and production capabilities for diagnostic and treatment quantities, must be evaluated.

"This report should include a thorough critique of projected waste streams from the operational facilities utilized in meeting our needs. Sound science will accurately inform the

public of the type and quantity of waste generated. The public will thereby have credible information that relies on proven science, instead of out-of-context pseudoscience that is currently disseminated in scare-tactic form by activist groups.

"A detailed cost analysis of how to meet our nation's nuclear infrastructure needs should also be addressed in the PEIS. Funding requirements for the construction of new facilities must be compared to resuming operations at the Fast Flux Test Facility. We have already invested millions in a premier facility that is capable of fulfilling a significant share of our future nuclear infrastructure needs. That investment must not be disregarded.

"Finally, any programmatic assessment of our nation's nuclear infrastructure should also include an evaluation of our educational opportunities for training future scientists. Creating a safer and cleaner environment will require highly skilled students of nuclear science and engineering. We must have facilities such as test reactors for hands-on learning for young researchers. These future scientists are the very

people we will rely upon in the 21st century to meet technological challenges such as nonproliferation, fuels development, and spent nuclear fuels.

"I appreciate the opportunity to provide these additional suggestions for the scope of the PEIS, to complement the reported scope of evaluating steady-state neutron sources for medical and other isotopes, plutonium-238 for NASA long-term needs, and conventional nuclear research and development needs.

"Most importantly, though, through its isotope program, the Department of Energy has an opportunity to greatly improve the quality of life for millions of Americans who suffer from cancer, cardiovascular, and other diseases. I urge the Department of Energy to recognize and embrace its responsibility to provide the quality and quantity of isotopes needed to diagnose and treat our patients.

"Slade Gorton, United States Senator."

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Okay. Yes?

We got a little bit busy earlier — and I know we have someone representing several congressmen. Yes, ma'am. Please.

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF REPRESENTATIVE ADAM SMITH

MS. HELEN WHEATLEY: Hi. I'm Helen Wheatley. And I apologize for my diminished lung capacity, but my lungs are being otherwise occupied, so I'll be a little slow. But as a member of the board of Heart of America Northwest, I'd like to read a statement for the record on behalf of Congressman Adam Smith:

"Hanford has 177 underground tanks containing 55 million gallons of radioactive liquids, sludges, and crusts. Right now, some of these tanks' temperatures are mysteriously rising to dangerous levels, and nearly 70 tanks are leaking highly contaminated waste into the vadose zone near the Columbia River.

"The Hanford budget is equally troublesome. We predict the compliance gap between the Tri-Party Agreement and Department of Energy spending to be nearly $80 million. Also, the DOE must appropriate 600 million next year to begin the process to remedy the tank waste problem at Hanford. Restarting the Fast Flux Test Facility will add to the Hanford's environmental and budget woes.

"First, the FFTF will send more toxic waste to the underground tanks.

"Second, the reactor restart will consume valuable budget dollars that DOE could use to clean up Hanford.

"Please terminate the FFTF program and direct the Department of Energy's full attention at the Hanford site to cleanup."

Okay. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF REPRESENTATIVE BRIAN BAIRD

STATEMENT ON BEHALF OF REPRESENTATIVE JIM McDERMOTT

MS. HELEN WHEATLEY: And now, like Congressman Smith, Congressman Brian Baird and Jim McDermott, much as they'd like to be here tonight, they've been a bit busy voting in Washington, D.C., so they couldn't make it here tonight. But they would like to submit their strong opposition to FFTF restart into the record in the form of today's *Seattle Times* editorial, *to wit*: "It is unwise and unsafe to restart the Hanford reactor."

Thanks.

THE FACILITATOR: Thanks. Can I get copies of those, ma'am? If we could get copies of those before you get away, it would be wonderful. Okay. Thanks.

Okay, we're going through the Federal list. Any other Federal-elected officials at this

point? I think we've covered those.

Anybody representing the governor's office or the state legislature? I remember there was maybe one person here for that. No?

Let me just see a showing — any other elected officials here that — yes? And you're, sir, representing a city or —

MR. KEN DOBBIN: West Richland.

THE FACILITATOR: West Richland, Washington. Okay.

STATEMENT OF CITY COUNCIL MEMBER KEN DOBBIN
WEST RICHLAND, WA

MR. KEN DOBBIN: Yes; good evening. I'm Councilman Ken Dobbin, West Richland, Washington.

Our city has adopted the humanitarian mission of restarting the FFTF to produce medical isotopes to battle cancer and other diseases. I will testify in Richland on the variety of complementary missions that would go along with medical isotopes, but the reason I'm here tonight is the disturbing information I got that elected officials here are starting to pass judgment and make motions based upon the bogus arguments of our opponents, like the ones we just heard, that FFTF will add waste to the waste tanks. That's absolutely not true.

I'm in Seattle tonight to refute the false testimony of these people, and to state that if that false testimony does prevail, that there probably is at least 1,000 children and 10,000 adults per year that will die because of a lack of medical isotopes. The NEPA process must take that potential loss of life into account.

Our opposition says there's no shortage of medical isotopes now. That's false. Patients here in Seattle have been denied radioactive prostate cancer treatment due to the lack of iodine-125 and palladium-103. Clinical trials with copper-67 have been halted due to an insufficient supply of that isotope. This shortage will only get worse when the new, exciting, and very promising cell-directed therapy becomes a first-line cancer defense.

And to talk about waste, our opponents talk about waste. FFTF produces very little waste. There'll be -- there'll be only approximately less than a truckload of low-level waste a year. Compare that with the submarine compartments that are being shipped every year to the — to the Hanford for burial. I don't hear our

opponents here saying, "Let's stop the submarine transport." The reason is —

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Stop the submarine transfer.

THE FACILITATOR: Sir, please —

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Stop the submarine transfer.

THE FACILITATOR: Let's extend some courtesies here, please. Thank you for that, but we're going to continue. Please.

MR. KEN DOBBIN: Okay. They say that we shouldn't — that we shouldn't spend two waste casks per year of spent fuel to cure these children. That's just absurd.

THE FFTF can be operated safely. I'm a nuclear engineer that worked twenty years on the FFTF, from 1974 to '94. That was during the construction, the start-up, characterization, operations, and shutdown. I know the safety of that, of that reactor. And I've heard no opponent, so far, in the last two years that they've been rattling the cage, that have gotten the safety right. They have no technical experts that have that type of experience to refute the safety record. Under the most hypothetical accident, the

containment holds and no member of the public is harmed.

The Department of Energy only has two operating reactors to perform all these missions that Ms. Brown talked about. That -- they just can't do that. So you have a choice: you can either use the FFTF or build new facilities. The new facilities cost billions of dollars; the debt service on that will operate this reactor.

So bottom line, what my position is -- speaking for the City of West Richland, is, without delay we should restart the FFTF, as soon as possible, and we should all get behind and support that restart.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. You have a copy of that for us, sir?

Any additional elected officials? Yes, sir; I'm sorry. Thank you. Yeah, you're way back there. Thanks.

STATEMENT OF CITY COUNCIL MEMBER NICK LICATA

SEATTLE, WA

MR. NICK LICATA: Thank you. My name is Nick Licata, a member of the Seattle City Council, and I'm here today to inform the

representatives of DOE and the people attending here and the people of Seattle that the city council members have unanimously signed this resolution opposing the restart of the Fast Flux Nuclear Reactor.

We are also opposed to any plutonium and other nuclear waste coming through Puget Sound and the Port of Seattle; and that it's our belief that this nuclear reactor, restarting it, is just the opposite trend that should be taking place at Hanford; that it's our understanding that Hanford is over $200 million behind in budget for cleanup costs, and that the continuation or restart of this nuclear reactor will result in a deferral of that cleanup cost and go in the opposite direction.

Now let me also state that today, as a courtesy to the council member who just spoke, who appeared at our city council meeting today, literally with fifteen minutes' notice, was — asked for us to delay the vote until next week, which we did as a courtesy. There was no other representative of any other group available at the city council meeting to add any balance to the comments that he made.

And even in the short time since he spoke, it's my understanding that, contrary to the impression that might be given that there's somehow a bogus amount of information out there that needs to be overcome, I think what we're facing here is a distribution of half-facts. There's a very much concern amongst city council members for human needs, particularly for medical isotopes. But the question that has to be asked is that — is this the facility, the appropriate way, to create those medical isotopes? And I do not believe that's the case, and I'm convinced that the rest of the city council, once they see the facts, will also agree, that at this time next week this resolution will be passed by the city council.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

Additional elected officials, anybody at this point? I don't see any at this point. Somebody? No; just a second. I'm just checking; let me check on elected officials. Any additional elected officials?

If not, we'll go ahead and move into the comment period, and I will start over at this microphone. Sir, the guy standing up, you want to

come up to the microphone? And then we'll come to this microphone. And just don't go and queue up, because I'll get to you. There's no sense in standing up there. We'll take a break in a little bit, and don't want you standing up there for naught, so —

MR. JIM TROMBOLD: I didn't hear your guideline on time for us.

THE FACILITATOR: I'm sorry; thanks. And I should repeat it. We have individual comments five minutes, and groups -- excuse me; anybody representing an organization, ten minutes. And I have a handy-dandy timer here guy, and I'll just sort of — I'll get your attention at one minute.

MR. JIM TROMBOLD: Okay.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

STATEMENT OF JIM TROMBOLD

MR. JIM TROMBOLD: My name is Dr. Jim Trombold, M.D. I'm an internist/cardiologist here in Seattle. I'm on the board of Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility, and the national board of Physicians for Social Responsibility. I'm also a public health representative on the Hanford Advisory Board. I'm speaking, I guess, for myself. I think our current president may speak a little longer for our

organization.

Real quickly on the medical isotopes, I think the public can get confused. I mean, no one — I mean, I'm a committed physician. No one is against getting the right tools for diagnosis and treatment of illness. But it's such a diversionary discussion that's really not even relevant.

We do need medical isotopes for diagnosis. A lot of treatment for cancer is research. No one is saying we don't need isotopes. Again, the question has been well stated by the city councilman, that we have read or understand and have expressed our views to Governor Locke and Senator Murray and others, that the National Institutes of Medicine says, “If we do have a shortage in the future, that there are cleaner, more efficient ways to produce medical isotopes than stoking up a plant like the Fast Flux.” So it's sort of an argument that's interesting, but it's really irrelevant.

The huge potential public — I mean, we're talking about treating children. I mean, come on. You're going to put the people concerned about starting the Fast Flux in a position of not loving children? We -- I mean, we all want to treat patients in the best way possible and — but the

overwhelming environmental potential public health problem, with potential cancer-causing effects, is a huge amount of waste.

Hanford has had its shot at production. Whatever you think of past production, necessary or overdone or whatever, a huge amount of waste that we need our absolute best expertise, talent, and funding to focus on that. And it's not cleanup; it is disaster prevention. It's environmental disaster prevention. It's public health disaster prevention. If we would stop using terminology of "cleanup," which we all — our mom told us to clean our room, and we could do it any time. It's not cleanup, it's disaster prevention.

Now, something bad over there happens, and we're all going to point fingers: well, why didn't we think about it, why — so let's invest some money in preventive medicine. And we've got to not add to the waste stream, whether it's little or big from the Fast Flux. We have such a huge amount of material, and need all of our expertise and funding.

Now, we've told Senator Murray, "Let's get off the jobs thing." And if you're with the chamber of commerce of Tri-Cities about jobs, we

want to get — quit calling it "funding"; go to Congress and say, "Here we got a disaster that's going to happen here; let's get some real funding, not for cleanup, but for disaster prevention, and let's triple the jobs over there for generations to come, to clean up the mess we've already made."

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Okay, we'll move over to this side. And a show of hands, people who want to comment — ma'am, right here.

STATEMENT OF KAY THODE
RAGING GRANNIES OF SEATTLE
WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM
SEATTLE WOMEN ACT FOR PEACE

MS. KAY THODE: Well, we are representing three groups.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay, hold on for just a second; I'm getting your copies here. I'm sorry; you're representing an organization?

MS. KAY THODE: We are representing the Raging Grannies of Seattle, the Seattle branch of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, and the Seattle Women Act for Peace Organization.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. So we're going with this statement here that you've handed me.

MS. KAY THODE: Right.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay, so ten minutes. Okay. Thank you.

MS. KAY THODE: We and hundreds of others have repeatedly provided rational arguments for shutting down FFTF, but still you persist in presenting proposals to keep it in operation. It seems that the wishes of the politicians and their corporate contributors carry far more influence with the U.S. DOE than the will of the people. We are beginning to wonder if direct action is necessary to move this government. With apologies to Bob Dylan, let me put it in song [*singing with associates*]:

"How many times must we come before you to tell you to shut that thing down? How many times must we testify before you will hear our call? How many times must we stand up here, before you will listen to our plea? The answer, my friend, is blowing in the wind, the answer is blowing in the wind."

In the hope that this is the time when you will finally heed us, I will reiterate the

reasons why restarting FFTF is a danger to the environment, to peace, and to cleanup:

First, to produce the isotopes involved, it involves transporting radioactive materials to Hanford, with the attendant risk of a spill.

Second, producing the isotopes will create more waste, when you do not know how to get rid of the waste you already have.

Third, this mission will detract from cleanup, which is already behind the legally mandated deadlines. And it's been stated it won't detract from cleanup, but if all the dollars that were put into this were put into cleanup, surely it would have some effect.

Fourth, experts have testified that there are other, safer, cheaper methods for producing medical isotopes. And I have heard experts, the head of the University of Washington Hospital, radioisotope section, testify here that they didn't need more isotopes, and that was last year or the year before.

Fifth, the proposed program includes classified weapons missions, which undermine rather

than strengthen our security. Now, it was stated that this does not, but I understand that the stockpile stewardship activities which were considered under this include simulated testing of weapons and design activities. So I would like more clarification on that.

Sixth, NASA has apparently indicated it does not need this program for advanced radioisotope power systems.

And seventh, we understand that the method whereby this proposal was developed violated Federal procurement rules and contract terms.

It is tragic that the profits of Battelle and the nuclear industry carry more weight with our government than the public safety and health of the people in Washington state. In the name of sanity, shut FFTF down, once and for all.

Let me finish with another song [*singing with associates*]:

"There's a crust upon the bubble in the tank — in the tank. There's a crust upon the bubble in the tank — in the tank. If the bubble should burst, you will see the worst disastrous mess that you have ever seen.

"If you don't know what to do with the tank — with the tank; if you don't know what to do with the tank — with the tank; then why on earth would you create a deadly new mistake by putting FFTF back on line?

"So concentrate on cleanup — do you hear? Concentrate on cleanup — do you hear? We don't need a new disaster dogging us forever after, so shut down FFTF for all time."

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

MS. KAY THODE: I have one last question — one last comment.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

MS. KAY THODE: I noticed in the material that was handed out that you're talking about privatizing isotope activities in order to reduce cost to the taxpayer. It seems to me that the privatization of this effort has resulted in a lot more cost to the taxpayers than it would have, if it hadn't been otherwise.

And to speak of sound science, it's sound science that brought us these leaking tanks; and I am sick of sound science.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you.

I've said earlier I've seen it all,

but I'm learning every day.

We will take — let's take one more over here, and then we'll take a five-minute break, restroom break. The restrooms are out to the side. I don't know if you need it, but I do.

Ma'am, how about right — or no; this lady back here. I'm sorry, let's start -- yes. Sure. Fine.

STATEMENT OF ELIZABETH TABBOTT

MS. ELIZABETH TABBOTT: Thank you. My name is Elizabeth Tabbott, and I'm actually testifying on my own behalf, although I do sit on the Hanford Advisory Board. But tonight, I'm just giving my own comments.

My understanding of this hearing is that, required under NEPA, you are scoping and you are trying to determine what impacts must be addressed in the EIS for each alternative.

I would say that first and foremost on my mind is that each impact — each alternative be analyzed for its effect on the Tri-Party Agreement. This is our legally binding agreement which the Department of Energy has entered into, and I think it's of utmost importance for the public to understand how those legally binding milestones might be affected. And this, of course, includes funding issues for the TPA.

And the second thing I'd like to see addressed in the EIS is the requirement to look at socioeconomic impacts. And "socioeconomic" is not limited to just the economic results of each alternative. There should be, in fact, a serious assessment of the social impacts.

I think that all of us who have watched the Hanford cleanup and the decision-making process with the Department of Energy and with their contractors are very aware of what the word "culture" means at Hanford. The culture at Hanford which we saw entering into this cleanup was just fraught with secrecy, with the "decide, announce, defend" attitude, the arrogance, the risk-averse tendency to not want to take action, but always do one more study. And the public that has been involved in the public involvement out there, the Hanford Advisory Committee — Board, has been very, very frustrated with that culture which has been very slow to change at Hanford. I do say it has changed somewhat; we are coming along.

But we still see things like constantly shifting bureaucracy, where jobs -- people's DOE tenure is far, far less than from meeting to meeting — and we meet sometimes once a

month. The result there is that there is no tendency for the decision-maker to have responsibility; they've shifted jobs. That's also true with your contractors. Contractors change faster than the public can keep track.

So I think that it's really — it's not that hard. It might sound a little soft science, but I don't think it would be hard to look at how each alternative could affect that culture that we have been trying so hard to change at Hanford.

Dr. Trombold mentioned the fact that cleanup has not had the right kind of connotation. Cleanup still doesn't have the right kind of connotation at Hanford; "production" sounds so much better. And that would necessarily take us back to a culture that we've worked very hard to get away from.

So I would hope that, in looking at the scope, that be a serious concern for each one of the alternatives.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

If we could take a five-minute break, and we'll come back in — the restrooms are out to

the side; I think there's a water fountain out there too. And we'll just pick up where we left off with the comment session. Okay? Thank you.

(Recess, 8:10 p.m. until 8:20 p.m.)

THE FACILITATOR: Let's go ahead and get started again, if we could. Thanks for coming back; appreciate it. Thank you for coming back so promptly; appreciate it, and appreciate the restroom break.

Let's go to this side now. The gentleman standing has been standing up there the whole time, waiting on me to pick him, in the blue and tie-dyed sort of side there.

STATEMENT OF NORM BUSKE

NUCLEAR WEAPONS-FREE AMERICA

MR. NORM BUSKE: Thank you. My name is Norm Buske, I'm here representing Nuclear Weapons-Free America. I've been working for the past year in the public interest, in response to the public interest, doing science on the river, looking at what is getting into the river because of the public concern with the salmon.

This last week we went public with the thorium springs at Hanford. That is, they have thorium leaking into the river where the salmon

spawn. Interest relative to the EIS on thorium is that if you look through the documentation, you won't see it. Basically, by looking at what would be affecting the salmon and looking at the river, what we've done is discovered a new waste stream from Hanford.

As I understand it, maybe something like 1,000 tons of thorium were used to produce fissile uranium-233. You probably didn't know anything about any of that. Well, it's just one of those little secrets, isn't it? Generally, DOE has been rather secretive in its operation at Hanford. If you are wondering about that thorium, by the way, you'd think, "Well, what about monitoring?" Those here from Richland probably know that Richland's drinking water comes from the river. They monitor upstream and downstream at Hanford — just oodles of radionuclides, but not thorium, and not the product that was produced at Hanford, uranium-233. So basically, there are these little holes. Now we go and look at FFTF, perhaps with some concern about whether there might be holes in the system or not.

What we're addressing on the EIS at the present moment is stated missions. And there's actually been sort of a little conflict about that.

If you go back a few months to April, with the predecisional draft on the FFTF, under the missions, but they really didn't talk about it, they had national security, and the creation of special isotopes at FFTF could supply in significant quantities.

This is sort of touchy, because, see, it couldn't be used, because it's a civilian start-up. That is, all the missions have to be civilian. This military mission couldn't be listed as a justification. So now we have a step further, where we have gone to taking this out of any mention from the mission. And basically, what I've done is inquired of the management to see what the game plan is, and it's "You start it on civilian missions, and then you just have this little client over here that you make — you make this stuff work." That is, "It's not a mission; we just do it on the side." Now, I think that's a — you know, sort of the way things are done, and I understand that since it would be classified, producing weapons materials, that we wouldn't be told about it.

But this is an EIS scoping hearing. And what I ask for is that the production mission, the weapons mission for exotic isotopes, be included

in the EIS, that if you say — rather than listing it as a mission and including it, you say, "As a potential client for DOE or DOD, we would produce these exotic missions." Now, those are classified, and I don't really want to get into them here. So in the EIS you go through, see a little chunk where it has to be classified, and we can't talk about those because of proliferation.

But then we can come out the far end and say what the effects of those materials are in the weapons for which they would be designed. And I would like that in the EIS.

If the United States goes into production of -- these are battlefield nukes, subtactical, small things. Actually, you should be able to fire it out of a handgun. If the United States goes into the production of those, we, as the policeperson of the world, we justify them. And what that means is, other people get to play the game, too. Well, that's fair enough. That means that basically you have, you know, little tiny mushroom clouds on CNN.

What I would ask, therefore, is that in the EIS where you include the battlefield nuke operations, that you include some representative

places where these might go off and what the effects would be. I would suggest Seattle Center would make a, you know, fine ground zero for — what would the impact be for one of the micro nukes. And I would like two kinds included: the direct ones with the superfissile materials, the super-smalls, and then there's some exotics. Because these are so fissile, you can put other materials in and get really, really lovely effects, and I would like those included also.

Thank you very much.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

Yes, sir.

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM BLAIR

MR. WILLIAM BLAIR: Thank you. My name is William Blair, and I'm speaking for myself. I'm a resident of Seattle, up here on Queen Anne Hill.

And I wanted to preface my remarks by saying that I once favored nuclear energy, and gee, I wanted to be a nuclear engineer or nuclear physicist, myself. But over the years, I've realized that nuclear wastes have half-lives of thousands of years, exceeding, actually, recorded history to this point. And plutonium is one of the

worst radioactive materials, both in terms of toxicity and also persistence, as well as neptunium.

And society, our society, appears to suffer attention deficit disorder, in that so far we've been unable to provide organizational and regulatory resources and financial resources to accomplish prudent disposal and long-term secure storage of these dangerous wastes. The Hanford Nuclear Reservation is a poster-child for this problem. The cleanup is far behind schedule, and the current Executive and U.S. Congress both appear to lack the will to fund adequately the cleanup procedure at Hanford.

Paradoxically, the Hanford reach of the Columbia River is a national treasure. I've had the privilege of leading three float-trips down the reach to look at the reservation and also at the natural environment on the other side. It's the last free-flowing reach of the Columbia in the U.S., thanks to the nuclear reservation. And it's home to the last significant spawning populations of native salmon in the Columbia River, and much of the wildlife there is dependent on those salmon.

I have applauded Senator Murray's proposal to include the reach in the National Wild

and Scenic River System, and to retain the Wahluke Slope and the White Bluffs in the Federal Wildlife Refuge System.

And I think it's incredible to consider restarting the FFTF, in view of the failure of cleanup efforts to date at Hanford and at other places in the U.S. There are radioactive springs, as the gentleman before me just mentioned, that we knew about before this — not that particular one, but there are radioactive springs on the south side of the river. There are "hot" plants, "hot" animals running around.

I understand the pressure for jobs. And if we must subsidize the Tri-City area, I think we ought to do it by accelerating the cleanup, not by increasing the waste stream.

I think the EIS should address the organizational issues of the failure of present systems to deal with cleanup of existing waste and of — I think that bears on the credibility and the ability of government to mitigate the adverse environmental impacts of developing existing -- developing additional waste with restart of FFTF, and to deal with those wastes in future cleanup programs.

At present, of course, the U.S. enjoys a very privileged position, which I enjoy too, as number one economically in the world. And if we haven't been able to deal with these issues so far, I really question how we are going to deal with them over the next 10,000 years.

One other thing I'd like to see in the scoping is to — always a critical question with environmental impact statements, is to address those mission projections, to reexamine them, and to consider as one alternative the effects of the — it's the classical alternative: demand management, conservation, and recycling. And I think that needs to be one of the alternatives addressed in this, in this EIS, along — and couple that with immediate shutdown of FFTF.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

Yes, sir?

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'd like to point out that everyone you've called on until now has gray hair. You said we're choosing people randomly?

THE FACILITATOR: I've been saving you for last.

Okay, go ahead. I'm sorry he — I

hope he didn't offend you with the "gray hair" comment, that you looked —

MS. SANDY GRAHAM: I didn't think I had gray; I thought I had blonde.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thanks. Go ahead.

STATEMENT OF SANDY GRAHAM

MS. SANDY GRAHAM: My name is Sandy Graham, and I'm here to speak —

THE REPORTER: Excuse me; Sandy —

MS. SANDY GRAHAM: Graham, like in Graham crackers.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

MS. SANDY GRAHAM: Yeah.

THE FACILITATOR: Thanks.

MS. SANDY GRAHAM: I'm here to speak on my own behalf.

I have a son — some of you kind of laughed, I noticed earlier, when Ken said that we have medical isotopes to save lives of children, where one of those children is mine. Probably when he was about four years old, he was diagnosed with a pialocytic astrotoma in the third ventricle, which they did a twelve-hour surgery, with a near-complete resection. And what that means is that you can't

totally remove the tumor. So they gave us hopes that it wouldn't grow back again, and for two years he was doing really good; every three months, MRIs. And then the tumor grew back, and he's seven years old now. Only option we have at this time — when children are ten years old you can't do radiation because their brain is not fully developed. So the only choice you have is do chemotherapy, and I don't know how many people out there know about chemotherapy, but it's — it's made him nauseous, lost weight, mouth sores, constipation. He was sick; it kills healthy cells, too. But that's the only choice we had to keep him, you know, alive. He was supposed to have chemotherapy for fourteen months, but thank God he only had it for six, and he was able to shrink it down to the size of a dime. He will have this the rest of his life.

I am here because I would like, for my son's benefit, to keep FFTF going, because he needs medical isotopes as another effort. Because every — every chance we have to stop cancer now can save lives tomorrow. And my son is probably — you don't know him. I put pictures up here. I've got a picture of him when he was four years old, after he had his surgery, and when he had chemotherapy. And

he's a tough little fighter, he really is. But a lot of you are against medical isotopes, but you know, one of these days it could be your child, your niece, your grandparent. It could be any one of you, and then you might think twice about it.

Thanks.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

Let's go to the gentleman over there in the — yes, there; thank you.

STATEMENT OF KIM SCHMIDT

TRI-CITY INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

MR. KIM SCHMIDT: Hello. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments regarding the scope of this draft environmental impact statement. My name is Kim Schmidt. I'm the vice president of industrial recruitment for the Tri-City Industrial Development Council, TRIDEC.

TRIDEC is a nonprofit organization whose objective is the economic development of the Tri-City area, which encompasses the Hanford site. Our membership is composed of over 350 business organizations, labor, and governmental entities having an interest in the Tri-Cities. We have been designated by DOE as the one voice for Hanford on economic development.

TRIDEC strongly supports the objectives of the Department's nuclear energy program, and specifically the utilization of the FFTF to meet the programmatic needs which have been identified in the recent program scoping plan for the Fast Flux Test Facility.

As a programmatic EIS, the need for these programs and methods of achieving them must be addressed on a global basis. We believe the evaluation of the alternatives will clearly show the advantages of the FFTF for the performance of the proposed missions. The suitability of and the impacts resulting from utilization of the FFTF for these missions will be clearly shown in a thorough, balanced, and objective evaluation of the need for each proposed mission and the methods of achieving the mission objectives.

We will not address the attributes of the FFTF in this statement, since these are being addressed by other commentators. Rather, we wish to identify specific topics which should be addressed in the PEIS.

First, mission needs. A number of proposed missions have been identified for performance in the FFTF. Each of the proposed

missions should be evaluated in terms of national need, alternative methods of achievement, the social and environmental impacts, and the comparative economics of alternatives. The programs which should be evaluated include:

Medical and industrial isotope production and utilization; Production of Pu-238 for identified space program requirements; Nonproliferation technical programs; Materials science; Research programs and related educational programs.

Second, FFTF operational issues. There are a number of issues related to the utilization of FFTF and meeting the identified mission needs. These can best be considered and evaluated through the EIS process. There is a substantial body of independently reviewed and validated information regarding the FFTF which will provide a clear and factual basis for consideration of the impacts or risks resulting from the restart and operation of the FFTF.

The EIS process must take cognizance of the agreement reached between DOE and the states of Oregon and Washington for the preparation of a waste management and minimization plan to ensure

that FFTF waste issues do not negatively impact progress on Hanford site cleanup programs.

The following issues should be addressed in the evaluation of the FFTF for a role in the proposed missions:

Production and operational economics; Comparative costs for shutdown and start-up of the FFTF; Nuclear and environmental safety; Environmental releases and impacts; Nuclear waste and regional impacts; Spent fuel storage and disposal; Operation management structure; Regional economic development and institutional impacts; Educational institution relationships; Operational privatization concepts; Independent safety and environmental regulation; Restart and operational planning; Nonproliferation and security issues resulting from the use of MOX or highly enriched uranium fuels;

Lastly, programmatic impacts of FFTF utilization.

The proposed missions which could potentially utilize the FFTF to meet national program needs or objectives need to be reviewed and evaluated to identify the impacts resulting from utilization of the FFTF.

For several of these topics, there are identified national needs or requirements which are not being met. The social, health, and economic impacts of not meeting these requirements currently and in the future need to be clearly identified. These topics include the following:

Medical-industrial isotope production, distribution, and utilization; this should include the benefits provided by the development of new or enhanced medical isotopes.

Production of Pu-238 to meet national space program requirements; Accelerator transmutation of waste, ATW; Proliferation-resistant nuclear fuels development; Fusion materials testing and evaluation; Solid-state and electronic system radioactive hardening; and Commercial Light Water Reactor life-extension materials testing programs.

A thorough evaluation of the topics and issues identified above will provide a clear and factual basis for decisions regarding the future of the FFTF.

We believe that the FFTF will be found to be a superior vehicle for meeting the identified program missions without any significant negative social, environmental, or economic impacts.

Operation of the FFTF will provide significant positive economic and social impacts, not only to the Pacific Northwest, but also to the nation. The supply of currently unavailable or limited medical isotopes for general use is of particular significance.

Local area business, labor, and governmental leaders strongly support the restart and operation of the FFTF. During the review of the draft EIS, we expect that these interests, as well as our own congressional delegation, will submit strong statements of support for restart of the EIS [*sic*].

We expect that regional and national environmental interests will also express their opposition to operation of the reactor; however, these are not the views of the local community, and reflect sort of a knee-jerk reaction to any new programs at Hanford, and particularly any consideration of restarting the Fast Flux Test Facility. We have reviewed recent letters which the Department of Energy has received from these interests on the FFTF. Many of the allegations contained in these letters are factually incorrect or do not apply to current program proposals.

We are submitting as an attachment to our testimony a compilation of previous position statements and letters from our congressional delegation, the state of Washington, and other regional interests supporting the FFTF. We expect that the same level of support will continue to be available in support of the FFTF for the currently proposed missions.

In closing, we request that the assets of the FFTF receive an objective, balanced, and realistic evaluation of the alternatives to be studied in the PEIS. And we look forward to the opportunity to review and comment on the draft PEIS next year.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Sir, with your hand up — sure.

And I'm coming over here; remind me, I'm coming over here next.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT FRANCO

MR. ROBERT FRANCO: Good evening. My name is Robert Franco. I'm an M.D., as a practicing surgeon in Richland, Washington, for almost forty years.

About half way through my medical practice career, I woke up to the fact that I'd become a cancer doctor. Seriously ill patients sort of gravitated to me, and the majority of these seriously ill patients had cancer problems. I learned to live with cancer on a one-to-one basis. I often accepted these people the first time they looked for a doctor. I did much of the diagnostic workup, did the treatment, and for a long time I did the chemotherapy follow-up checkups; I got thoroughly acquainted with cancer. After all these years, I still have to say that we have not controlled cancer. When I read in the journals, which I still do today, read some of the progressive things that are happening, I'm just awestruck. But really curing cancers is still far away.

Here's the message I want to give, and it's personal. I think it's almost sinful for any potential treatment method to be cut off at the roots before it gets a chance to make itself felt. And right now, of course, we're talking about isotopes, medical isotopes. FFTF is clearly the best way to produce these. You've heard the arguments.

I was impressed particularly by Ms. Graham; that's an everyday thing in my practice. People who just reached the end of the road, no place to go. After I retired, I was medical director of a hospice in our area, so I got acquainted on a further plane with dying patients. And some of these people have nowhere else to go. Occasionally, with isotope research, there are places for them to go. So I ask you to look into your hearts. And I ask some of you enthusiasts to consider that by cutting off a potential treatment method, you might be helping some of these patients to reach the end of the road prematurely.

Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is it possible to ask a question of this man?

THE FACILITATOR: No; we have hundreds of people. Thank you. We have still many, many hands, and I appreciate it.

Thank you, sir; appreciate it. Okay. Thank you for your comments.

Yes, sir, right here in the green shirt. Yeah.

And I'm coming over to this side next time; remind me. Yeah, I will.

STATEMENT OF DAVE JOHNSON

MR. DAVE JOHNSON: My name is Dave Johnson, and I'm here for myself, although I am an alternate member of the Hanford Advisory Board, with Heart of America Northwest.

The main point that I want to make tonight is that a specially designed accelerator-based neutron source facility is a much better way to make medical isotopes than restarting the FFTF reactor. The programmatic environmental impact statement, or the PEIS for short, should analyze an accelerator-based neutron source for making medical isotopes.

Also, since Los Alamos National Lab is very experienced in this type of facility, they should be included in the PEIS to analyze accelerator options.

As a background, I worked at Hanford for a number of years beginning in 1960. I worked as a senior scientist in the FFTF reactor physics group. I also worked on an accelerator-based neutron source project at Hanford. One of my jobs on that project was to measure isotope production by the accelerator.

Based on my experience with both the FFTF and the accelerator, I believe the accelerator is a much better way for making medical isotopes. The design for an accelerator facility can easily be adapted from an existing design. The design was developed between 1977 and 1984 with the Westinghouse Hanford Company as the lead contractor. Los Alamos National Lab was the accelerator contractor. It was developed with DOE funds from the Magnetic Fusion Energy Research Program. It was called the Fusion Materials Irradiation Test Facility, or for short, the FMIT Facility. It was never built because of limitations in the fusion budget.

There are five million reasons that I believe an accelerator-based neutron source for medical isotopes is a better option than restarting the FFTF, and should be included in the PEIS.

First, it should be pointed out in the PEIS that an accelerator for medical isotopes would produce far less dangerous nuclear waste than the FFTF. The FFTF will produce large quantities of fission product and transuranic nuclear wastes. These are very difficult to deal with, as evidenced by DOE's difficulty in demonstrating a permanent

solution to disposal of wastes from nuclear reactors. On the other hand, an accelerator for medical isotopes would produce neither fission products nor transuranic isotopes.

Second, it should be pointed out in the PEIS that an accelerator for medical isotopes would be dramatically safer to operate than the FFTF. In an accelerator, there would be no concern for an uncontrolled chain reaction. Moreover, there would be no need for a containment vessel, as with the FFTF.

Third, it should be pointed out in the PEIS that it would be cheaper to build an accelerator-based neutron source than to restart the FFTF. Based upon the FAIT Facility cost numbers, I estimate it would cost less than $200 million for an accelerator facility, compared to at least $229 million to restart FFTF.

Fourth, it should be pointed out in the PEIS that it would be cheaper to operate an accelerator facility than to operate the FFTF. The FFTF would require, in the proposal, at least $55 million per year to operate. Based upon the cost from the FMIT Facility, I estimate it would cost only about $10 million per year to operate an accelerator for medical isotopes.

Finally, the fifth item is that it should be pointed out in the PEIS that an accelerator-based neutron source is significantly better than the FFTF at cost recovery. The FFTF is predicted to cost much more to operate than the revenues it would bring in for several years. The initial deficit for the FFTF is a whopping $24 million per year. In contrast, the cost for operating an accelerator-based neutron source is so low, it would be matched by the initial $10 million per year revenue predicted from medical isotopes alone. If revenue from medical isotopes were to increase as predicted in the FFTF proposal, an accelerator-based neutron source would turn a substantial profit.

THE FACILITATOR: Thirty seconds.

MR. DAVE JOHNSON: Okay. In summary, I believe an accelerator-based neutron source for producing medical isotopes has many advantages over restarting the FFTF. There would be far less dangerous nuclear waste, it would be dramatically safer, it would cost less to build and to operate, and the revenue from medical isotopes would match or exceed the operating cost. I believe an accelerator-based neutron source for producing

medical isotopes should be included as one of the options in the PEIS. I also believe that Los Alamos National Lab should be included in the PEIS to analyze accelerator options.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you; appreciate it. Thank you.

Yes, ma'am, right here.

STATEMENT OF DANA GOLD

MS. DANA GOLD: My name is Dana Gold, and I'm a staff attorney with the Government Accountability Project. GAP's mission is to promote government and corporate accountability, and we do this by working with whistle-blowers who disclose violations of law and threats to public health, safety, and the environment that they witness in the workplace.

One of the key issues GAP focuses on is keeping Hanford, the most contaminated site in North America, accountable, and to protect the environment, workers, and the public that are so often the victims of the secrecy and Cold-War culture that, in spite of a federally mandated cleanup mission, continues to motivate the Department of Energy that controls the Hanford nuclear complex.

The proposal to restart the Fast Flux Test Facility represents the height of government and corporate insanity, that incredibly, is given legitimacy in the form of public hearings and proposed programmatic EISs that actually present a process by which the government can hope to ram its goals of putting Hanford back into production mode, despite the fact that it has created one of the most dangerous messes known to humankind. Restarting FFTF can't be allowed.

And fundamentally, the biggest reason is because the proposal is funds- — it's inherently unsafe. First, the design of the reactor is a fast flux design, and we have internal DOE documents that have essentially said that it's inherently unsafe. And they estimate that there's a 30 percent risk that during the lifetime of the reactor, that it will require an evacuation of people and the interdiction of livestock and crops during the life of the facility. This is unbelievable.

In addition, this is a sodium-cooled reactor. And I don't know if you know this, but sodium ignites with oxygen. So if there's an earthquake that causes a break in the cooling process, with a reactor that was built before a new

fault line was discovered at Hanford, that could be a nuclear nightmare that we've exactly been foreseeing.

The proposal also requires the import of highly enriched uranium or plutonium fuel. This is the same fuel that was used at the facility in Tokaimura, Japan, that resulted in exposure to workers and the public. And this fuel, because of the high plutonium content, has an inherent risk of a criticality release if safety procedures aren't followed. And I can tell you, as a representative of numerous workers at the Hanford facility, that it is common practice that safety procedures are not followed at Hanford, and that workers that report the fact that safety procedures are not followed are retaliated against, silenced, and harassed. And this is a problem with the Hanford facility.

Let's see. Another risk from the high plutonium fuel content is the need to — with the importing and the storage of the fuel, is that there will be increased transportation of the fuel on our public highways and our train systems. In addition, there's a terrorist risk that's created by the existence of the fuel, as well as the waste that's going to be created at this site, which leads

to a higher degree of security at the site, which goes completely in contrast with the need for openness that we've encouraged with the cleanup process. So with this highly enriched plutonium, it inherently changes the nature of Hanford to a culture of secrecy and national security that shuts the public out from the problems and exposing them as they exist at Hanford.

In addition, there are multiple waste streams that are going to be created through the process that we've identified tonight, not only in the creating of the fuel that will be used to run the facility, but also — in running the reactor, as well as creating the fuel on the target, neptunium targets, targets that will be imported from Savannah River to run the reactor, but also in separating the plutonium that they want to create from the fusion products. So we're talking multiple waste streams here, and all of these waste streams have to be considered in the PEIS.

In addition, the waste has highly enriched plutonium in it, which also has the same protection needs with the — for the terrorist risk, and has inherently unstable qualities from the criticality that is presented by the highly enriched plutonium.

Which brings us to the waste issues that all of us — most of us are actually familiar about. We have a third of the tanks that are leaking at Hanford. Only last year, the DOE admitted from whistle-blower disclosures that have been identifying the fact that the waste has been leaking into the vadose zone and has hit the river. They only admitted this last year. There's no plan to clean up the river that we know is contaminated, and the impacts to this on agriculture, salmon, the food chain, and the drinking water are inestimable. Inestimable. And it is clear that they have said there's not even enough money in the DOE budget for cleanup to identify these new risks that have been identified.

In addition, there's no room in the tanks or — and the tanks aren't appropriate storage for the — for the fuel, for the waste fuel that I've just talked about that's going to be created. The tanks are corroding. The tanks are already full. So it's not just that we have an existing waste stream problem, it's that there's going to be more added that's actually — it has a different character and quality to it.

So there's no plan at this point as to what to do with the waste which is the same situation that explains why we have a cleanup problem from the original production mentioned in the first place. Have we learned nothing?

We're not against medical isotopes. We know — we just know that there's no need for medical isotopes. There's no identified need. Dr. Janet Erie of the University of Washington, who's the chief head of the nuclear medicine department, has said that there's never a problem with getting nuclear — with getting medical isotopes. And the irony of a facility that causes cancer justifying its existence by allegedly treating cancer is blatantly offensive.

Hanford is supposed to be in cleanup mode, and it should be a laboratory of cleanup; that's exactly what its mission should be. Fundamentally, the whole character of Hanford will be changed if FFTF is restarted. More secrecy will be inherent to the nature of the process. And the Department of Energy and Hanford contractors have evidenced only a consistent inability to be unaccountable to the — inability to be accountable

to the public, and to meet their legal obligations as they even extend — extend today. There needs to be a cleanup mission, not a production mission.

Thanks.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

I'm going to go to the center aisle a couple of times here because I've ignored everybody in the center. Sir, here with the yellow tie — or yeah; thanks. Two yellow ties out there? No? Okay. Okay, thanks. Yes, sir.

MR. EVAN KANTER: No, only me.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay, thanks. Yes, sir.

STATEMENT OF EVAN KANTER

WASHINGTON PHYSICIANS FOR SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY

MR. EVAN KANTER: My name is Evan Kanter, and I'm representing the organization Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility. I'm the incoming president of that organization.

As a physician, my singular interest here today is to protect the public health. The Hanford Nuclear Reservation is the most highly contaminated nuclear site in the Western world threatening the public and environmental health of the Northwest. Permanently shutting down the FFTF

is part of the legally binding 1989 Tri-Party Agreement between the U.S. Department of Ecology, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Washington State Department of Ecology.

The Washington Department of Ecology, in a December 1998 letter to the U.S. DOE, has made clear that, quote, "Generation of any additional liquid reprocessing wastes at Hanford is unacceptable, when we do not have any capacity to safely store, retrieve, and stabilize millions of gallons of legacy wastes." Restarting the FFTF would produce new high-level radioactive waste streams at the Hanford Nuclear Reservation.

I ask you to recall the terrifying recent nuclear accident in Tokaimura, Japan, where hundreds of Japanese workers and families were exposed to high levels of radiation. Many of the possibilities that are suggested in this EIS would require a very similar process with the restart of FFTF.

The Washington State Medical Association, the Washington Academy of Family Physicians, and the national board of directors of Physicians for Social Responsibility have all passed resolutions opposing the restart of the FFTF, and I quote from one of these:

"The Washington Academy of Family Physicians opposes the restart of the FFTF for any production mission, and supports the urgent cleanup mission of the Hanford Nuclear Reservation as a prescription for disaster prevention for generations to come."

This is the voice of your family physician; think about that. What other interest would your family physician have, other than protecting the public health?

Also, I must say that I speak on behalf of a Nobel prize-winning physician's organization, an organization that won the Nobel prize largely for educating the public on nuclear issues. Some of the proponents of FFTF restart tonight have spoken about a humanitarian mission which disturbs me greatly. I think that these folks need to come to us and get some pointers, really.

The plan, the scoping plan, the plan to restart the FFTF, is an affront to the public. It is a desperate attempt to come up with a mission, any mission, for a facility that should be considered a Cold War relic and be put to rest.

The proposal to produce plutonium-238 for the space program at FFTF is dangerous to public health. Plutonium is one of the most toxic substances known, and plutonium-238 is actually 300 times more radioactive than the plutonium-239 that was produced by Hanford for nuclear weapons for half a century. The proposal to produce plutonium-238 for the space program would create more waste streams.

Ms. Colette Brown, herself, of the Office of Nuclear Energy, has stated publicly that, quote, "Right now it is cheaper to buy from the Russians than producing it domestically. Producing it domestically will create a waste stream," unquote. That's from an interview in the *Seattle Post-Intelligencer*. Department of Energy officials have also said that they would not make plutonium-238 at FFTF unless the reactor were restarted for some other purpose.

FFTF is also not the appropriate facility in which to make medical isotopes. The most authoritative source on the supply and demand of medical isotopes is the Institute of Medicine's 1995 report, "Isotopes for Medicine and the Life Sciences." This report dismisses the proposed use

of FFTF, a research reactor designed to test breeder technology, as inappropriate for producing medical isotopes. A university-type research accelerator, like the one that David Johnson described, would be much better suited to produce both a greater variety of isotopes and higher quality isotopes. The Institute of Medicine report concludes that an accelerator facility at the University of Missouri would be much more appropriate if it were to be retooled for medical isotopes production. That would be the most appropriate facility, or else the consideration of building a new facility.

While Physicians for Social Responsibility clearly, fully supports the use of medical isotopes for research and therapy; it is appalling to me that a program that will increase the risk of cancer is touted as helping to cure cancer.

DOE's own internal documents suggest a significant and unacceptable risk of large-scale radiation and sodium-coolant release from this facility requiring the evacuation of people and interdictions of crops and animal products in eastern Washington.

Restarting the FFTF would also require transporting highly enriched uranium or plutonium fuel to Hanford, again the same type of fuel fabricated in Tokaimura, Japan. This would increase the threat of disastrous train or truck accidents in our region.

The cleanup problems at Hanford are immense. One-third of all the nuclear waste tanks at Hanford are already leaking. Radioactive materials have reached the groundwater that flows into the Columbia River. Two years ago, there was a serious explosion in one of these tanks. Recently, there was an alarming report of unanticipated corrosion in the walls of the new double-walled tanks.

And finally, the increased risk of restarting the FFTF is happening right now, every day. Because the time and attention we are paying now to restarting a reactor is diverting attention away from the only legal and responsible Hanford mission: environmental cleanup.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay, thanks.

The gentleman right here in the — gentleman right here. Yes, sir. Yes, I'll go to the middle a couple of times here. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF LES DAVENPORT

MR. LES DAVENPORT: Thank you. I'm Les Davenport from Richland, Washington, and I do support restart of the FFTF reactor.

In particular, the programmatic environmental impact statement must consider needed capacity for isotope production for the next thirty-five years. Thirty-five years, ladies and gentlemen. And currently we have two reactors: the High Flux Isotope Reactor at Oak Ridge, and the Advanced Test Reactor at Idaho Falls that have capability to produce medical or industrial isotopes. And if we utilized both of those, we would barely have enough to do the current keeping up with the need for medical and industrial isotopes, and it would displace other DOE programs that are important to the national well-being.

Purchasing Pu-238 from Russia is a great idea, except that, as you know, they don't have the most stable system. And although an agreement for a five-year extension has been negotiated to buy Pu-238 for about a million dollars a — yes, a million dollars a pound, it's estimated 2 million dollars per kilogram, do we want to depend

on an unstable nation that may or may not want to sell us Pu-238 if we don't have assured capability within the United States?

We have to consider the use of the FFTF in terms of developing medical isotopes. And this reactor is the only facility that's a sodium-cooled fast-breeder reactor in the United States that can produce these isotopes, whether you're talking about the medical or industrial isotopes. You can tailor the energy of the neutrons in the Fast Flux Test Reactor so that they can produce the isotopes at the — at the optimum quantity. Because we can both produce a fast neutron spectrum and slow the neutrons down through epithermal, and if we want, we could reduce the energy of those neutrons to thermal. Thermal isn't the best way to do it; but the epithermal and fast neutrons are uniquely available at the FFTF in reactors. And if we consider the possibilities of producing these required isotopes, an accelerator may be a very good way to produce them.

But I've, also, gone through the budgeting process for DOE for current fiscal year 1999 and also 2000 and — excuse me; 2000 is the current fiscal year; 2001 is the upcoming. And it

is the congressional problem in funding Hanford cleanup that's the problem. The agreement — Tri-Party Agreement milestones can be met if we get adequate congressional funding. It's not a problem of too few trained and qualified people; it's the money to do the work. And if everyone helps to contact our congressional representatives, we may be able to solve this problem. If you're looking at cleaning up along the river corridor, the 2001 budget is essentially a shutdown budget for Bechtel Corporation. Do you want that? That's a congressional problem.

THE FACILITATOR: Thirty seconds.

MR. LES DAVENPORT: Think of writing your congressional representative.

Also in the PEIS, we must consider the fastest way to make a decision. The FFTF has been on standby since 1995, and it's costing us 30 to 40 million dollars a year to keep it in standby. I recognize that this is a decision problem with the Secretary of Energy; but, it's a problem that is taking DOE money, and something must be done to get this decision through and decide what way we're going to go to proceed so that we can produce the medical and industrial isotopes and the

plutonium-238 to fulfill the civilian missions that DOE is required to support.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay, thank you. You have a copy of yours?

THE REPORTER: I have one.

MR. LES DAVENPORT: I did give him a copy.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Thank you; appreciate it. Thank you; appreciate it.

We're going to go all the way to the back, to the lady in the very back there with the blue and brown — ma'am? Yes. Thank you. Sure, it's a long walk up here; appreciate it.

STATEMENT OF AN AUDIENCE MEMBER

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm impressed by so many of the speakers' knowledge and articulation. And I'm representing the common folk who have tried to be watchdoggers through the years.

My comments are not necessarily opposing the development of isotopes because I am not that knowledgeable. My comments will deal, then, with the Hanford Reservation.

I'm aware of a study done in 1983 by Westing- — a private environmental group at the request of EPA. It was silenced by DOE. But I do

know they had already said at that time the water table was probably being affected.

The problem of pointing that out is, nothing was done until Chernobyl blew in '86 to point out that the nuclear reactor was similar in construction.

I have been on the Hanford Reservation, and it's very helpful to have been there. But I'm aware that the DOE is far more open at this point. I will have to commend Secretary Richardson for trying to promote a much greater openness. Because this has been very frustrating for those of us who try to be — in my case as an educator, to help the students I work with and have worked with, to be knowledgeable. And we couldn't get adequate information.

Now, having been on the reservation, I understand where the locations are. And the FFTF is further down, closer to the middle, and to the east of it is the WPPSS plant. It's a beautiful facility; Westinghouse was running it at the time when I was there in 1988. Then a little further south would be the Westing- — at the border is the Westinghouse. Now, they've gone through a lot of problems, overspending and a few other problems; that history we're not bringing up here.

Now, when we're talking about the cleanup — and the terminology that the physician — I'll have to get used to saying that, "disaster prevention" — is on the river, that peninsula. But there is some vagueness related to even the location of FFTF. And I understand that there's evidently a policy that we don't get a map in this material. So I think we need to ask for a little further clarification from DOE on some very precise information. That makes it easier for those of us who want to be knowledgeable and sane about our approach to be more helpful and to accept — aside for the isotope dilemma; I wish I knew more about how to solve that. If the FFTF is not near a major cleanup problem — but it is on the plume that was referred to, the Two-Dam plume, but it wouldn't necessarily affect the development.

But this is my other comment: having been familiar with educators in Richland even before 1980, we couldn't even talk about the problem, who taught there. Then in '88 we could talk a little bit about it; but there was a big public relations to try to keep the thing going. Many people at that time were there from the beginning, and people that live in Richland. It's part of a culture, and I

don't mean this negatively. But it does impact the difference of how we have to talk to the persons more impacted by the removal or the shutdowns. And I empathize, but I think we've got to have a lot more openness.

I would say that in the interval since '88, the amount of money that has been wasted — I've been at hearings. Some of us were probably at one a few years ago at a hotel downtown. The DOE was apparently not open; the EPA was. That's what we're asking for, that there be even more openness about the facility itself, what would happen if they have it there in relation to the cleanup issue, so if the DOE could be encouraged further to be totally open, I think we will find much more sane responses to acceptance or rejection.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

Yes, ma'am, right here. We'll do this one, and we're about -- yeah, come on up. We're fifteen minutes past the published time. We'll — I'll take an inventory of how many people have yet to comment, and we'll take another five-minute break and charge ahead with getting through as many as we can after that for a long time, so — Yes, ma'am. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF CAROL WOODS

SIERRA CLUB, CASCADE CHAPTER

MS. CAROL WOODS: Okay. My name is Carol Woods, and I'm a Hanford activist with the Cascade Chapter of the Sierra Club.

THE FACILITATOR: I'm sorry; could you give us your last name again? I'm sorry.

MS. CAROL WOODS: Woods, W-o-o-d-s.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

MS. CAROL WOODS: First off, I would like to just respond a bit to the pictures of the boy up front. I don't think there is anybody here who would want that boy not to have every possible medical help that he could. It's not that we don't want him to have the help; it's that we don't want the problems caused by Hanford, the possible accidents and the leaking into the Columbia River, to cause more children to become sick like that.

I want to talk a little about -- well, one little detail first. I have here the Battelle report on the Hanford site. And on page 4-30 it lists some things that are coming out of riverbank streams on the Columbia River, and it mentions tritium, strontium-90, technetium-99, iodine-129, uranium-234, -235, -238, a bunch of metals including chromium and a bunch of anilines.

Now, we know that chromium is very toxic to young salmon, but for the tritium, strontium-90, et cetera, I don't believe there are studies of the effects of these materials, these elements, on developing salmon. And I think that it's important that those studies happen.

Finally, though, back to the FFTF, many people love this place dearly. It's very, very special. We have things like old-growth forest, we have orcas and bald eagles around the Sound, we have pristine lakes and rivers, and a lot of us love that very, very much. And against this backdrop, the Department of Energy is using the Columbia River as a nuclear septic system. I simply want to say, “That is not okay.”

And I just could reiterate what people have said so much before: we just want you to keep your promises in the Tri-Party Agreement about cleanup. This is very simple.

We don't want money diverted from environmental management to nuclear energy. I understand this has happened. I've seen DOE e-mails saying FFTF can restart because $31.1 million of EM money, which is environmental management, is now in NE money, nuclear energy money. I take that to

mean that the claims that money has not been diverted is false. I must conclude that. And that is not okay.

Let's see. I'm going to skip on to a second subject, and this is just me talking now, this is not The Sierra Club.

But all that has gone on since the '40s at Hanford has been justified in the name of national defense. And I'm going to question that. The assumption is that creating more and more nuclear weapons will make us safer. It seems to me, absolutely obvious, that as long as we continue to do this, we are going to encourage other countries to join the nuclear club. And many of them will be unstable countries. And the more that happens, the more easy it will be for terrorists to get a hold of either nuclear weapons, or at least nuclear materials that could be spread around a place like Washington, D.C. — shut the place down. Now, this seems so easy; I'm amazed it hasn't already happened.

At the same time, these very nuclear weapons would be absolutely useless, both for defense against such an attack and for retaliation. There would be nothing we could do in response. And

this is so obvious to me, I have to assume it is obvious to someone like Osama bin Laden. And frankly, I'm afraid: I think I am being set up, and I'm very, very concerned. So I want to challenge the assumption that it is — that all this contamination of our state and the Columbia River is justified because of national security.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

I'm going to take — take one more, I think. The gentleman back here in the blue shirt, if you could, you — thanks. Now I'm going to switch. Now I'm going to start this way and back that way, so — okay.

STATEMENT OF PAT SCHWEIGER

MR. PAT SCHWEIGER: I'm going to try to set a new standard by going short; I don't want to stay here too late.

I want to say that I'm Pat Schweiger, a citizen of Washington state, and I've worked at FFTF like the fine gentleman here. I'm not presently employed at that site.

I wanted to say to Shane and Colette, thanks for listening to all this tonight. I can see that you're listening to both sides; I really appreciate that.

I've been on the Internet, and I've noticed that in Australia, they're struggling with the same issues that we're struggling with tonight. They've got a reactor down there that's creating medical isotopes, and they're debating whether they should use an accelerator or should they use a reactor. And if I read it correctly, they're doing both which is interesting.

I guess I want to see the U.S. lead the development of medical isotopes. And I've seen the capabilities of FFTF. I don't see how we could possibly have a thirty-five-year mission and not run that facility as part of that plan.

So that's my input to the PEIS. And thanks.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Thank you.

We're going to take a break till 9:30, about seven or eight minutes from now. Restrooms — you know where they are. We have the room for a while. How many people still want to comment? We're running about ten to twelve an hour. Two, four, six, eight, ten, twelve, fourteen, sixteen, eighteen, twenty-two, twenty-four — well, get some coffee. Thanks.

(Recess, 9:21 p.m. until 9:36 p.m.)

THE FACILITATOR: We'll get started.

We've had a few people who had to leave or catch a bus or whatever, have handed in their comments. So if you're going to listen for a little bit and you have prepared comments, we do have an opportunity to take those written comments here. We're going to start back in the back of the room, and I'm going to get this young gentleman right here in the blue, with the — yeah, right.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Let's hear it for those of us who are under thirty.

THE FACILITATOR: Under-thirty?

STATEMENT OF AN AUDIENCE MEMBER

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I myself am not an activist; I simply make decisions based on the information that I have. I've joined Heart of America Northwest simply because I believe what they are doing is correct. I am a citizen; I am a taxpayer; and I am a voter; and these are my beliefs coming from me.

What I think needs to be done before I can even begin to think about supporting the FFTF reactor is four things. And most of them have already been covered; I just want to make sure that you hear what I think.

The first thing that needs to happen is a full, honest look into alternatives which I have seen coming from the plans that have been put forth. And this really needs to be investigated. I recognize the need for cancer relief and for the medical isotopes; but, I don't believe that the FFTF reactor is the best way to produce these things.

I believe that there needs to be a budget overview. We heard from many people on the budget shortfalls and the misdirected funds of the Hanford site. I believe that — do we need more money for the Hanford site for the cleanup, for the production, and for the sustaining of the reactor in its place? If that money is needed, then we need to get it. If no more money is coming, then we need to focus on the problems that are present now. We need to focus on the problem of the cleanup. We already have a problem to solve. It's the cleanup; it's the reactors; it's the leaks; and it's the tanks. If you need more money, and you're not going to get it, then you need to focus on the problems that you have, not the problems that you are going to have with sustaining a new reactor and keeping it running.

The other thing you need to focus on, and this is the most important, is the cleanup. You have waste in the groundwater, in the local ecology. This kind of thing has been documented. It has been seen in studies. No more study. You could put more studies out; but no more needs to be done to tell you that this is already happening. You have tank containment problems with tanks overheating, overflowing, and corroding clean through. These problems need to be solved immediately. Aside from starting the FFTF reactor, you need to focus on these problems.

Hanford is run by the government, by the Department of Energy. The government makes the laws. The laws say that Hanford needs to be cleaned up. Hanford blatantly disobeys this. It seems to me that the government is operating above the law because it can. What needs to happen is that Hanford needs to obey the laws that we need to obey. If I have to obey the speed limit, Hanford needs to clean up. Those are the laws the government makes and everybody needs to obey them, including you. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you. I'll move over to this side, then

we'll come back to the middle. Ma'am, in the blue — yeah, sure. I'm sorry — no, go ahead. No, go ahead. That's fine; go ahead here, sure.

STATEMENT OF BARBARA CEPEDA

MS. BARBARA CEPEDA: I am Barbara Cepeda, and I live in Seattle, but I lived in Richland. My mother worked at — for GE. And I heard her every night during high school complaining about how they weren't allowed to follow the rules. And Russ Knight was one of the whistle-blowers then, but he didn't get in the paper. He was the only one of the managers there that tried to protect the people at the lowest level, to follow the rules, and he had to fight top management.

And I also happened to live for a year as a housekeeper in the house of the guy who got the contract to design the structural steel for Hanford. He was the best structural steel guy, consultant, in the state of Washington. I put this on the record before, but I think this is an indication of how we cannot trust our own country and our own corporations to do what they say they're doing as far as cleanup. He was a very conservative person, Sig Iverson. He's dead now; but he did the design for — he did the structural steel design for

the Husky Stadium, first one. He was hired because he was the best one in the state. And he was very angry because as a conservative and a friend of the big industrialists in the city — they took his design and cut it in half. In other words, they hired the best engineer they could, and then didn't take his specifications.

And what I would like to do is -- just very quickly, is say that we've got to put on the record an objective baseline in a micro-way, not just a micro-way by having those test wells everywhere. We need to get the international atomic energy agency to monitor this. We need somebody who isn't making money by fouling up the system. We have got a very bad -- it's like designing an electric circuit with a lot of feedback, but you do not have a clean system that doesn't — we create noise, but we don't have a clean signal. And we won't get it until we have somebody that's totally outside the money-making aspect of not doing what they say they're doing. PR is not going to do it.

And I'd just like to put on the record the fact that none of the above proposals do what we need to do, and that is clean up. And from your previous EISs on — this is document DOE/EIS 0222D, revised draft of Hanford remedial action. And

this is just a document that stated the area where you're going to be running the Fast Flux Reactor, the maps where all the contamination is right now. At page 4-24 – these should go in your record. It's on the Quincy Sands, so that that shows where the – let's see, the plumes – I don't know; I don't want to take more time now. But I would say that you should include all the – all of the maps that are n this document that show the contamination as it exists now in your proposals to put further contamination at that site including the chinook salmon that go through there and the – then on page – okay. Particularly – it's nice it's a little red dot here, 400. That would be – this is page 4-113 of the document cited. And the distribution of radionuclides of concern in groundwater within the Hanford site, 4-116. And then there's a bunch of pages in here which I've just lost that talk about all of the contamination that exists now at that site, and how dangerous it is and how they aren't able to contain it now. So I would suggest that you use your own EISs and include the relevant data in this EIS.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

We'll go all the way back against the wall, since I've missed — oh, I'm sorry; when I come back there, you're next. Sorry; my fault. Come over to this mike.

STATEMENT OF DARRELL FISHER

MR. DARRELL FISHER: Thank you very much. My name is Dr. Darrell Fisher. I'm a medical physicist, a member of the Society of Nuclear Medicine and the Health Physics Society.

I can agree with the commenters, most of you, who would like to see the cleanup to continue, but that is really a separate issue and a separate budget. And we can do both.

My work involves the design of new radioactive drugs for diagnostic and therapeutic purposes. The biggest problem that we have is that the medical isotopes that we need are not available. I try to purchase isotopes quite a few times a year, and can't get them. I would like to see the Department of Energy move more quickly toward getting the FFTF restarted so that we can do the research that we need to do. Isotope availability is a huge problem.

One of my colleagues, Dr. Janet Erie, has made a statement that we don't need additional iodine-131 — iodine-131, which is the isotope she uses. But she doesn't say we don't need the research isotopes that many researchers are trying to develop and use, and I think she's been misquoted many times on that. She's a colleague that I work with on some studies up here in Seattle.

Dr. Trombold so eloquently said that there are cleaner, more efficient ways to make medical isotopes. Unfortunately, the physics don't allow us to use these other methods to make the isotopes that I need in my work, and they're quite a — there's a long list, perhaps twelve or fifteen, that can only be made using the reactor physics characteristics that the FFTF is capable of. And we just can't make these anywhere else. If we could, I'm sure somebody would, but it's just not possible due to the physics.

The FFTF is kind of unique; it has a high flux, high energy, a spectrum that can be tailored to produce isotopes. It has a large core. The Institute of Medicine did not report — back in 1993 did not say that FFTF was not a good source of medical isotopes. It said that -- it did give

preference to the University of Missouri because the University of Missouri reactor needed some funding. Unfortunately, that reactor is really very small. It can't make the kind of isotopes that I need in the quantities that we project will be needed in the future. But we are trying to work with the University of Missouri because they don't have hot cells; Hanford does. They can't make targets or process targets; Hanford could do that. So we're trying to work with the University of Missouri toward that goal.

Dr. Trombold talked about disaster prevention, and that's the last thing I'd like to say about FFTF. If there's going to be reactors on this planet, then you would want it to be like the FFTF. Among all the reactors that have ever been built, this is the only reactor that is really very, very safe. Essentially no emissions, essentially no radiation exposures to workers. It has never leaked to the ground. It has -- it doesn't leak radioactive materials into the atmosphere, and you can see that from the Hanford environmental monitoring reports. Everything is contained. It's a low-pressure system — very, very safe. If you're going to have reactors for any purpose, that's the

one you want to keep. It's got all the capabilities that we need. And with about a $2 billion investment and a $600 million bill to take it down and clean it up, it's a lot cheaper, actually, to run it. The bad thing is to put it on standby year after year and do nothing with it, at a cost of — it costs about $30 million a year because of the Federal regulations that apply to it, just to keep it doing nothing. And that's where the money is being wasted.

THE FACILITATOR: One minute.

MR. DARRELL FISHER: It doesn't use the same fuel as at Tokaimura. That's really a misstatement.

There is no 30 percent risk of an agricultural nightmare; that's a complete falsehood that Heart of America Northwest has propagated. There is no scientific basis for that. I've read the reports.

As far as the fact that safe procedures aren't followed at Hanford, I'm a scientist with Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, and I can tell you that the safety requirements are so strict, we hardly can get our work done. Since I work with radioactive materials

in the laboratory and try to design new drugs, do animal experiments, I'm under all the requirements.

THE FACILITATOR: Fifteen seconds.

MR. DARRELL FISHER: And they are very, very strict. There just is no goofing around on that issue because I have to obey them.

My time is short, but I would plead for understanding. If any of you would like further information — I don't work at FFTF, but I would sure be happy to help provide further information.

Thank you very much.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

I'm going to go over here to the person I missed. I'm going to go to her first, and then I'll come to you, and then I'm going to come to the middle. How's that? So one, two, then I'll go to the middle. Sorry I missed you earlier; that was — never call on just blue, right? Okay.

STATEMENT OF TAMARA TRAVERS

MS. TAMARA TRAVERS: That's fine. My name is Tamara Travers, and I live here in Seattle. I also work at Heart of America Northwest, but I'm speaking on my own behalf here.

I don't think that any of us are saying that we're -- that we're against curing cancer, that we're against curing cancer for children, and that — if people need these isotopes, they should have them. I think what a lot of us are saying is that FFTF is not a good place to do it. As you've — we already have 60 percent of the nation's nuclear waste out at Hanford. 68, as it's been — I'm reiterating: 68 of the 177 tanks are leaking already into the groundwater. And as we have seen in June, I think it was, they actually found strontium-90 and chromium on the banks of the Columbia River. And also, I think it was two weeks ago, there was a big article in the *Seattle P-I* about -- it was titled "Nuclear Blob Grows at Hanford," about one of the tanks which has been growing, and is going to be growing out of the tank soon. That is 69 tanks that are leaking. We have no more room. We have no room to add all this extra waste to the tanks, when we have so much of this is already leaking into the groundwater.

Producing -- restarting the FFTF reactor — as you said, we have a six-year supply of fuel for that. If you — and if it's going to be running for thirty-five years, if I can do my math

right, that's twenty-nine years where you have to find fuel from some other way. Processing plutonium creates liquid high-level nuclear waste. And it would slow the emptying of the tanks so that 90 percent of the tanks — of the waste will still be in the tanks by 2018.

Too — with this programmatic EIS, you must disclose all the harm and the risks of the cleanup that we're actually talking about here. Thirty-two million dollars a year has basically come out of the environmental management budget and gone into the nuclear energy budget. And that 30 million — $32 million a year is greatly needed in the cleanup program and needs to basically go back to the cleanup program. Restarting the FFTF will take more money out of cleanup when we already have, as I've reiterated, 68 out of 177 tanks that are leaking.

Basically, all what I am saying is that the FFTF reactor needs to be shut down. Cleanup needs to be at priority. And if we can't — if we're having such a hard time dealing with the waste that we have, we should not be making any more waste. Thank you very much.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

We'll come here, then I'll come to the middle and make sure I do that, and then go to the other side. We'll take two from the middle after this.

STATEMENT OF FRED MILLER

MR. FRED MILLER: My name is Fred Miller.

Also, like a lot of other people, I support curing cancer. I think our main effort should be at preventing cancer; an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.

There is someone represented here who does not support curing cancer; that's Senator Slade Gorton. In the *P-I* this morning, it was announced that he had acted to cut hundreds of millions of dollars from Medicaid including a lot of medical research money. Not too long ago, he voted to give the Pentagon $7 billion that they hadn't asked for. That's where his real priorities are.

I, also, have an article here from the *New York Times* from October 18th. I quote from page A12: "Supervisors at a government nuclear fuel factory near Richland, Washington, sometimes told workers to ignore rules intended to prevent

accidental nuclear reactions, according to an Energy Department investigation." Lying, incompetence, and greed has been the history, has been a key part of the history of Hanford since its inception. As you are writing the environmental impact statement, I want you to consider the environmental impact of people who are lying, cheating, and stealing. There is no way that you can create a nuclear reactor — or for that matter, an automobile — that is safe if somebody is deliberately misusing it. And we have, not a small probability, but a likelihood that the people who are running the Fast Flux Test Facility which may be, as the gentleman earlier said, an extremely safe reactor — the people who are running it will turn it into something else. The history is there. The history from Rocky Flats, from Fernald, from Los Alamos, from every single Department of Energy facility indicates that Hanford is going to continue Hanfordizing with the Fast Flux Test Facility.

I noticed one example of that this evening. Mark Twain said that half of the truth is all of a lie. On the poster in back here titled "Examples of Isotopes and Their Uses," they list

fourteen isotopes with twenty-six different uses. None of them were military or national security-related.

The biggest consumer of radioactive material in the nation is the military. The military missions have not been addressed in this. You have said that there is no military mission; but in this document it says number three among the potential missions of the restart, "The nation's nuclear research and development needs." The biggest consumer of research and development in nuclear fields is the Pentagon. The Pentagon will certainly be using the Fast Flux Test Facility for whatever purposes it feels is important for it. The Department of Energy's nuclear weapons people have already proposed this. That should be brought out and should be addressed honestly.

The performance to date has been that inquiries about plutonium-238, about stockpile stewardship uses, have been refused. The people requesting that information have been told, "We'll give it to you when you've got adequate security clearance."

The military is also possibly a source of plutonium-238. Plutonium-238 is the power source for the electronics on nuclear warheads. We have dismantled many of our nuclear warheads. The batteries from those are sitting someplace with their Pu-238. NASA could be using that to make up their deficit in plutonium-238 needs. That's another factor that should be considered in the environmental impact statement.

One other way that the military missions has been sidetracked and hidden is talking about NASA as a civilian agency. It is not; it is quasi-military. Many of its missions have a military purpose.

THE FACILITATOR: Thirty seconds.

MR. FRED MILLER: Most of the space shuttle missions were military in nature, and that was a key part of getting the space shuttle funded. Many of the military spy satellites use plutonium batteries.

I look at the government as a single entity. If it has military and civilian plutonium-238, those are only different bookkeeping categories, not different ownership. It can simply

decide that civilian plutonium-238 tomorrow is military, or in the other direction, that surplus military plutonium-238 is civilian. That's a significant, potentially very significant source of additional plutonium-238 for civilian missions.

THE FACILITATOR: And that's five minutes. Okay.

MR. FRED MILLER: Thank you for your time.

THE FACILITATOR: Thanks.

Have to go back there and look -- yeah, thank you. And I'm going to — thanks.

STATEMENT OF GARY TROYER

MR. GARY TROYER: I'm Gary Troyer from Richland, Washington.

I'm in favor of restarting the Fast Flux Test Facility and support continuing the advance of medical isotopes research and production.

This facility, owned by the public, should be put to use for the benefit of its owners. It was a proved — it has a proven record of safe and diverse capability. Its flexibility to produce a variety of medical isotopes, and in quantity, is unparalleled.

It is noted — notable that the use of medical isotopes is expanding. This tool of diagnosis and treatment of medical maladies, ranging from arthritis to cancer, is growing rapidly. It is noteworthy that these methods are sufficiently respected worldwide for investigators to garner several Nobel prizes over the years. On examination, seven of the last ten Nobel awards in medicine would not have been achieved without the use of special nuclear isotopes and associated methods. The stimulation of basic investigation into cures for medical maladies has long been an accepted part of our government resources. Restart of the FFTF for the furtherance of lower cost medical diagnostic and treatment methods can enhance this effort. Use of the FFTF has significant potential to improve health and save lives; it must be used.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Thanks.

All right.

STATEMENT OF DAVID McGRAW

MR. DAVID McGRAW: Hi. Good evening. My name is David McGraw. I'm a resident of Seattle. I'm here on my own behalf. I've got five different

points that I would like to make tonight as briefly as I possibly can.

First of all is, what the hell are you thinking wanting to produce more waste at Hanford? And did I actually hear somebody say that a restart won't cause more waste at this facility? I thought that every time you use a nuclear facility, it causes waste. I just think that that's the way it goes.

From what I've read, there's already 2- to 300 billion gallons of waste in the ground that cannot be contained at this point. I read in a newspaper article that someone figured out that that's a lake the size of Manhattan Island, forty feet deep. Now, Manhattan Island is approximately thirteen miles long and three to four miles wide. And it's — obviously, waste is being added to that all the time.

The water — the waste in the ground, groundwater is just now starting to reach the Columbia River in the form of tritium. Tritium is basically nothing compared to what will be there in the next ten years. If nothing is done to stop the waste that is going to enter the Columbia River, that river is, at best, a dead river within a

hundred years. At best, a dead river. Now, I wouldn't personally want to be drinking any water or have my crops irrigated with that water. I guess if you don't have a choice, you don't have a choice.

What about the safety of the people in the Tri-Cities? What about the safety of the people in Seattle where the waste is going to be transported? I don't believe that Hanford or the people who run it have shown themselves to be very capable of responsible waste management. So my number one point is: “What the hell are you thinking?”

Number two: What about the Tri-Party Agreement? I think that's basically enough said. I think we've been fooled by that one. And in fact, I actually read the Tri-Party Agreement when I was doing research on Hanford, and just about every single page has something about public involvement and environmental protection: "public involvement and environmental protection," flip the page, "public involvement and environmental protection," and then a little sentence that says that the DOE reserves the right to use this facility for whatever it wants, and then it continues on with "environmental protection and public involvement."

Third point after the TPA: We're not stupid. I personally believe that medical isotopes is basically a scam. I think the medical isotopes probably would be produced. But at best, the isotopes produced by Hanford are controversial; it's not a definite thing.

I really agree with the man who spoke before about the military plans. I would really like to know what the military plans are. I don't personally believe that the military won't be using any products that come out of Hanford. I think that's BS.

Where are the safety risks? I haven't heard anything about safety risks coming from any officials so far.

Fourth point is that: We are an intelligent, informed, and united public; and we will unite to stop this from happening. I don't believe that the public is the problem. We are here to protect ourselves. We're here to protect people from getting cancer. That's why we're opposed to any more waste.

We're not opposed to medical isotope production. Believe me, I'm from New Jersey; I think it's considered one of the most toxic states in the entire country. I've had — is it not? I

mean, I've had family members and best friends who have been cancer patients, survivors and who have died. I believe that New Jersey has such a high risk, high rate of cancer and asthma and other diseases because of how toxic and polluted it is. I believe Hanford and the Hanford area has such a high concentration of medical problems and cancers and whatnot because of the production that's been going on there for the last forty-some years.

I would like to say to the members of the public who are here in support of FFTF as a medical isotope producer, I'm afraid that — I just want you to be careful not to get used by the different — by the Department of Energy or by the Tri-Cities Business Council or whatever economic — whatever people have economic interests in this thing. I think that they need your support.

I want to read a quote that comes from a member of the AMS which was a private business that was trying to use Hanford for tritium. The quote is:

"Focus all PR efforts on the humanitarian mission," quote/unquote, "of the FFTF, medical isotopes and materials for research. Do not mention any proposals for increasing reactor activity. The humanitarian mission must be

highlighted and exploited to the maximum."

Exploited to the maximum. Now, my question is, “Who do you trust?” The public who is here to protect ourselves, or the government and business interests who are there to protect themselves?

Thank you very much.

THE FACILITATOR: Yes.

STATEMENT OF NANCY RISING

PEACE ACTION WASHINGTON

MS. NANCY RISING: Good evening. My name is Nancy Rising. I am the president of Peace Action Washington, and I am on the national board of Peace Action which is a national organization. In the state of Washington, we represent over 16,000 households.

This is not a wonderful time. We felt very, very strongly of the need to pass the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and we all know what happened there. Now here we are again. And I'm very sad tonight for a variety of reasons.

I did have a — I did have written testimony. I did not bring it because it's pretty much the same as it was last time, and so maybe you can just whip out the last hearings. We're talking

about similar things. In the last hearing, that statement that the gentleman talked about, about "emphasize the humanitarian aspects of the isotopes," certainly was evident. But what came out was, basically, what we wanted was tritium. And it would take about twenty-five years before — twenty to twenty-five years before any isotopes were produced, and yet that's pretty much all we talked about.

I'm very sad tonight because we — this seems to be such a — I don't know, you can call it a scam, a fig leaf or whatever, as to what the real issues are: "We want to make plutonium, folks, and if we can get all these people talking about isotopes, it will sound so good."

I truly believe that the people here from Hanford want to do good things. I don't think it's these people that have created the incredible climate of mistrust that we have in this state for Hanford. And when you talk about culture and you talk about climate, I think it is very important to take a look at that.

Senator Gorton talked about environmental extremists. Well, boy, there's a lot of us. I certainly am, I guess, in his — in his

category, and probably all of us here tonight that are concerned. But the people that tried so long and so hard to find out what had been happening in Hanford were certainly called environmental extremists. And Hazel O'Leary, bless her heart, just before she left, opened up a lot of the records for which we are very thankful, and for which we found out some dreadful things had happened. The "green run" of radioactive iodine wasn't a mistake and it wasn't an accident. It was a cynical ploy to find out what happens when you release that into the community. And we're finding out just what it was, even though the study that showed a huge number of thyroid problems and cancers the study said wasn't significant, and then everything blew up, and now they're reconsidering that. The vicious, egregious experiments that were done on people — we know of Tuskegee and what happened there, but we're now just finding out the horrible, horrible experiments that were done on innocent people that really didn't know what was going to happen. Those things were done. Now, you put that in a context and you wonder why we are not this tremendously trusting public any more.

And the gentleman said that this is a

different issue than cleanup. Well, perhaps it is, but it's certainly linked. It will be brought to you by the same fine folks that aren't doing the cleanup, that have gone back on their word, that cannot meet the milestones. And when they can't meet the milestones, they just want to change them. I think it's probably possible that these good things could happen, but I think it's entirely probable they won't. We have been lied to so frequently. And you know, the thing is, we're saying that there isn't enough money for cleanup, and it's a separate issue. There isn't enough money for cleanup, but we can find money to do this?

The promise was that we were going to clean up, and certainly the waste going into the Columbia River. And you know, so the point is, we will do what we want to do, and what we want to really do is make plutonium.

And it was mentioned, the space race and this sort of thing. This summer, our organization had their national congress in Albuquerque, and we heard a lot about these things, and we heard of what is loosely referred to as "nukes in space" by people who have been studying these things very, very carefully. And basically,

the U.S. is bound and determined that we are going to control space. And how do we do it? Well, part of it is like Cassini. And you know, the interesting thing was, people were concerned about Cassini because there had been about three launches of the exact same vehicle that had crashed. We were very lucky Cassini did make it. But it's very dangerous.

And so it seems to me that, while I'm sure you believe that this is only going to be for civilian use, seeing as how everything else is classified, it would be very simple to just kind of sidetrack some of this for — well, we could call it — we could call it civilian use. After all if we control space with our nukes, it's protecting the civilians, right? So because it's all classified, I'm sorry, but they can do whatever they want.

And so I wish I could testify on particular, you know, fine points, but I think you've heard a good deal of that with excellent, excellent testimony.

But please understand, we have absolutely no reason to be trustful. We would like to be. This is our country; we care about it and we love it. And I would hope that every six months we don't have to come down and do this. Maybe we

should tape it and just — we could all — think of how much time we could save. It's sort of like a nonparty: just send in your money, and you don't have to go. Maybe we could just send out tapes and we could say, "Yep, I listened to them, and it's all the same." So please do go back and take some of the information from the tritium hearings because it's the same stuff folks, and "What we really want is plutonium, and we don't want to deal with, you know, what the DOE wants, and we" — it's more fun dealing with that than it is cleanup. But what do we really need? Cleanup.

And I will leave you with one statement that was, I think, quite telling in the last hearing. A woman stood up, who was a kindergarten teacher, and she said, "You know, I don't know a whole lot about nuclear power and all these things, but I do know that the first thing I teach my children when they come into my class is, 'You clean up the mess you got before you make another.'" Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Yes, sir?

STATEMENT OF BRIAN WATSON

GROUND ZERO CENTER FOR NONVIOLENT ACTION

MR. BRIAN WATSON: Thank you for

calling on me. I have to take a ferry soon. My name is Brian — my name is Brian Watson, and I'm speaking on behalf of the Ground Zero Center for Nonviolent Action. We are primarily concerned with the Trident Nuclear Submarine — Submarines Base, just a few miles west of here on Hood Canal.

And something that I would like included in the environmental impact statement is — addresses just the potential military uses for the restart of FFTF. I think the medical isotope thing is — just as this other gentleman said before, it's a PR effort.

And last time I was at a hearing like this, it was tritium. And unfortunately, tritium has basically one use, and that is to make hydrogen bombs. And hydrogen bombs have bad connotations because they have mushroom clouds associated with them, and mass murder and genocide. We remember Hiroshima and Nagasaki, as we should. So now tritium is off the menu; but, we're talking about radio- — radioisotopes, and that's a good thing for curing cancer.

On a personal note, I grew up next to Rocky Flats in Colorado. I was totally unaware, as a child, of what was going on over the hill. I

assumed that everything was okay, but it wasn't. In fact, the year I was born, 1969, as you can read in one of the recent issues of the *Bulletin of Atomic Scientists*, is the day we almost lost Denver because they had a fire where they were manufacturing plutonium pits. And these pits were, I guess, plutonium-239. I'm not a nuclear engineer; I don't know these things. But I do know that plutonium is extremely, extremely dangerous. If you put water on it, it could have a criticality. If you let it burn, who knows what could happen? That day, we came very close to a disaster in a very — a very highly densely populated area, Denver, my home. On that day, radiation was released.

I don't know if I'm carrying that radiation in my body right now. I found a lump in one of my testicles a few months ago. The doctors told me it was nothing. It could be something. I'm going back. My brother had his lymph node — some of his lymph nodes in his neck — excuse me; his thyroid glands removed when he was six years old. Who knows what that's caused by? I know that radiation goes right to the thyroid.

I don't think the proposal for producing radioactive isotopes is being really

honest with the public, and frankly, I don't like that. I'm the public, and I don't feel like I'm being told the honest truth. I think the reason why — the proposal to start FFTF again is simply to keep the nuclear mission going in this country. And as long as we keep the nuclear mission going in one form or another, we will have the capability to keep producing nuclear weapons. That's it.

On a final note, does anyone remember the Martian Explorer that crashed into Mars a few weeks, months ago? Well, Cassini could have done the same damn thing. And all you scientists, I hope that you've got it straight. Okay? All you people who are experts at this stuff, I hope you get your figures straight, your millimeters and your inches. Okay? Because there's people down here who don't know all the science, and we're trusting you. But we've been lied to by you, and we are angry, and we want it to stop. We don't want this reactor restarted. We want it shut down. We want cleanup to proceed. No more nuclear production, period. That is all we want.

I know that you all have very good intentions. Some of my friends' parents, because Rocky Flats was similar to the Hanford area, you

know, the main employer -- my friends' parents worked at Rocky Flats. They were all told that everything was okay. We now know that that's not true. Good intentions are only part of it. The truth is that there are some things that we just don't know what we're dealing with, and that's what some scientists have said when they contemplate the tanks at Hanford: we don't know what the heck is going on here.

The nuclear genie cannot be put back in the bottle; but, we definitely have to contain it. We have to corral it. We have to rein it in as much as we possibly can. And playing around with this reactor is definitely a step in the wrong direction. Please listen to us. I speak from my heart here.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

I want to go all the way to the back, the young lady that's coming up, I think, here, who's been patient with me, who wanted to come — everyone's been patient with me, but she asked a couple of times, so —

STATEMENT OF CHARITY SCHWEIGER

MS. CHARITY SCHWEIGER: My name is Charity Schweiger, and I live in Kennewick, Washington.

Yesterday was the twelfth anniversary of the death of my grandmother. She suffered for six long years before dying of cancer at the age of fifty-three. I never got to know her. I never got to experience having a grandmother, having someone spoil you rotten and then send you home, someone to see you perform at school, someone to believe in you and be there for you. I never had any of that.

The medical isotope production and research at FFTF could save lives, like my grandmother's, in the future. I support FFTF fully, and I think that you are all highly misinformed. My father and his father have both worked at Hanford. Please support FFTF.

Thanks.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

Let's go here with the lady in the green — sure. I say that, and there's two ladies in green right next to each other, so I have to learn my lesson here. Yeah, okay. Thanks.

STATEMENT OF SASHA SEIDOVITZ

MS. SASHA SEIDOVITZ: Hi. My name is

Sasha Seidovitz, and I'm here on my own behalf, but also as an advocate of the work done at Heart of America Northwest and as a student at the University of Washington.

I object to the restart of FFTF on a number of grounds, but I'd like to focus my comment on the claimed need for medical isotopes.

The authors of Battelle's FFTF restart proposal forecast significant increases in the demand for medical isotopes. And in my understanding, a similar forecast was presented in the early '90s, and that forecast was proven false. In fact, many of us have heard testimony from reputable physicians who claim that their own use of medical isotopes — their needs are being met.

To counter an earlier comment, I have not heard anyone here speak out against medical isotopes. However, many members of this group, myself included, are opposed to the production of medical isotopes at the FFTF reactor. As Jim Trombold asserted, the National Institute for Medicine has identified cleaner, more efficient ways to produce isotopes. As Dave Johnson pointed out, an accelerator would produce less dangerous nuclear waste and would be dramatically safer to operate.

In light of the fact that FFTF alternatives are safer, that they produce less waste, that they cost less capital and far less money to run, wouldn't it be wise to face rising medical isotopes demand with such an alternative? If FF- -- or let's see -- FFTF's backers claim that they want to help cancer patients. Why are they promoting reactor restart rather than something safer and cheaper? Why are they promoting the production of new waste, waste which Hanford's history indicate are quite likely to be neglected and quite likely to pose a threat to the public health and the environment in the Northwest.

To conclude, I would urge the Department of Energy to consider a fifth alternative, one not yet included in this PEIS: end this tedious search for an FFTF production mission, focus on cleanup missions at Hanford, and deactivate FFTF permanently.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Thank you.

Go over here to the gentleman in blue over here. Yes. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF DAVE HALL

MR. DAVE HALL: My name is Dave Hall. I'm a physician. I am the past president of Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility and also a past national president of Physicians for Social Responsibility nationally, an organization of about 15,000 folks who are dedicated to the long-term public health. Specifically, Physicians for Social Responsibility got its accidental start, if you will, if you want to by Three Mile Island — the PSR, just by chance, had its inaugural invitation to membership in *The New England Journal of Medicine* which came out just three days prior to the meltdown at Three Mile Island, and is one of the reasons why I am here because there were 2,000 people who responded immediately to that. And subsequently, the U.S. civilian nuclear power program has essentially been put on hold because of the safety concerns.

I have a resolution from the national Physicians for Social Responsibility calling for the shutdown of the Fast Flux Test Facility. I won't read it, but I will present it to you. And I appreciate your patience in listening to all of us here.

And just a couple of comments about some of the comments made earlier, and we'll go from there. I want to raise a question about what managed care is going to do in relation to these isotopes that you hope are going to be produced. We're just in the process of trying to get managed care to pay for basic medicines, so I would ask you to add that to the environmental impact statement in terms of the potential funding for the use of these, these isotopes. We've already made reference to the 1995 National Institutes of Medicine report. And I would like to just note, is that report in your library of information?

THE FACILITATOR: Which one is that? I'm sorry; the —

MR. DAVE HALL: National Institutes of Medicine —

THE FACILITATOR: Yes; okay.

MR. DAVE HALL: — report on medical isotopes. You have that report?

THE FACILITATOR: Yeah.

MR. DAVE HALL: Okay; thanks very much.

And just one final comment to the folks in Richland, Pasco, and Kennewick. I very

much appreciate the search for an economy that has some stability. Seattle in 1979 had a billboard up that said, "The last one out, please shut off the lights." That was when the Federal program for the SST was dropped, and the western part of the State of Washington's economic dependence on Boeing became severely obvious to the folks in Seattle. And since then, this economy has become much healthier as it's substantially diversified. Hopefully, the good folks in the Tri-Cities will look to some other ways of using the enormous brainpower that's concentrated in the Tri-Cities for other constructive humanitarian uses.

Thanks.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you. Did you have a copy of your statement, too, sir? Do you have a copy? I thought you did, yeah. Thanks.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I don't have any organization, I'm just going to speak for myself.

THE FACILITATOR: I'm sorry; I picked her.

Go ahead. Thanks. Sorry.

STATEMENT OF CHRISTINE WONG

COMMUNITY COALITION FOR ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

MS. CHRISTINE WONG: Thank you for allowing me to come here and speak tonight. My name

is Christine Wong. I am with the Community Coalition for Environmental Justice. And we are a multiracial, nonprofit organization based here in Seattle. We have members all across Washington state. And our mission, our job, is to make sure that we look at the -- and address the disproportionate environmental health impacts on communities of color and low-income communities here in the state.

And I'm here today to talk about something that I don't believe has been addressed to the crowd before tonight, and that is looking at the impact on the Native American nations and the Latino farm workers living in the area.

There are nine Native American nations living near the Hanford site, and I'm going to read them off: the Coeur d'Alene, the Colville, the Kalispell, the Cootenai, the Nez Perce, the Spokane, the Umatilla, the Warm Springs, and the Yakima. These reservations are their homes, and you're desecrating their land by further starting up this FFTF plutonium production. I think it's just absolutely disgusting and cultural genocide.

I also think that for the Latino farm workers living in the area, it's not their choice to

be living in the area. They're forced to be living in the area because that's the work that they're forced into. What about — I mean, they're exposed to pesticides on the jobs picking apples, packing apples. They have to live there. What about the synergistic, multiplicative, additive effects of pesticides and radiation? Has that ever been studied?

What about the cultural ways of life that are going to be destroyed by further production at Hanford? You have to look at the whole point that Native Americans fish from the river, they play by the river, they live by the river. The Columbia River, again as everyone is saying, is so contaminated. Well, a lot of people here, I'm sure, don't fish from the river and eat the fish there. Well, what about those people who do?

I believe that the Columbia Tribal Fish Commission, CRTFC — they did a study a couple of years ago that showed that Native Americans tend to eat the whole fish from that river. And I did a lot of work on this issue in the San Francisco Bay area, and it shows that the risk assessment is flawed because they do not take into effect that people of color, Asian/Pacific Islanders, Native

Americans, eat more fish than their typical Eurocentric model. Okay? So I want you to put that in your environmental impact statement that people are eating this fish and that they are going to be impacted on their regular lifestyle.

So I'm not going to waste people's time. I'm not going to waste people's time and say everything else that everyone has said before, but I just want to make sure that you know that if you restart this reactor, you know, you're killing a whole generation of people to come.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

Now I'm going to go to over here; I've passed you by several times, I know, and pointed to you incorrectly a few times. Thanks. Go ahead.

STATEMENT OF AN AUDIENCE MEMBER

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm just here by myself, and the reason I — I don't like to speak in front of crowds, but the reason I decided I needed to get up is because I worked at NASA for thirty-five years. I worked on the Voyager programs and the Galileo programs.

And since the beginning of the NASA mission back in the 1960s, 1950s, there have been four missions that have flown to the outer planets that used plutonium-238. They used them in the radioisotope thermionic generators to provide power for the spacecraft. Only four.

Am I too close to this thing or —

THE FACILITATOR: No, come on up a little closer, actually.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: So the point I'd like to make is that these missions were provided with plutonium-238 in the midst of the Cold War when we were — when we were pumping out nuclear power to weapons of all sorts, and yet they could be provided with their requirements.

From this point on -- I saw your poster back there; you show four missions on the surface of Mars. There is not a way in the world that NASA will put plutonium-238 on the surface of another planet. Not a way in the world. We, on this planet, contaminate our own place, but NASA has long since said they will not contaminate other planets. They even -- even heat the surfaces of the spacecraft to kill all the biology that might be on them. You think they're going to put radioactive

material on the surface of a planet? They will never do it. So you're talking about the —

Cassini is on its way now to Saturn. And there's no other mission that can be funded because the space station is gobbling up all the funds that NASA has from as far out as we can see.

I don't know where in God's world you got this idea that you needed to make plutonium-238 for NASA. I haven't got the foggiest idea. How could this be coming out? There can't possibly be a reason to do that. And if that's a third of your mission, then a third of it's gone. So now you're down to two-thirds, and you can talk about that.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay, I'm going to go all the way to this side now, all the way to the back, and the gentleman in the pink jacket back there. I'm going to come to the center next.

STATEMENT OF ELDON BALL

MR. ELDON BALL: My name is Eldon Ball, and I live in Seattle.

In 1945, Harry Truman gave the orders that dropped the only two atomic bombs that have ever been used in this world. Now, fifty-six — excuse me; fifty-three years later, fifty-four years later, we are living with the consequences. One of

the things which Harry Truman is also attributed as saying is that there are lies, damn lies, and statistics. And I think tonight we've heard them all.

Now to make it very simple, there have been probably — who knows, 20,000 weapons, nuclear weapons, I understand, the United States has. That is plenty of plutonium-238 so we probably don't need any more. Okay.

Now, as for using medical isotopes as a source — or using the Fast Flux Test Facility for a source of medical isotopes, that started to come up when they were talking about producing tritium. The tritium was thrown out, so now that is the main thing. It appears to me that, you know, it's really a deceptive practice, and there are other sources.

It appears from the testimony given earlier tonight that a linear reactor — or linear accelerator would be a far better source with a lower cost, less chance of waste.

And already we have — what was it, 68 of the tanks at Hanford that are leaking? We don't need any further waste there. Let's clean the place up and get the job done. We don't need this continuing on for another century.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: I'm going to the center, which I've ignored for a while.

STATEMENT OF DONNA KELLER

MS. DONNA KELLER: My name is Donna Keller. And I don't have any written documentation, but I will turn in a report I did for my Master's degree process entitled "The Hanford Nuclear Site, Environmental Justice and Environmental Equity Issues: Transforming a Culture of Secrecy, Human and Environmental Damage to a Culture of Care and Commitment."

And I hope that -- and I know you must be tired, and you're doing lots of touring and listening. Hopefully, I'm sure a lot of this is — I don't know. I don't know if you're listening or just getting paid a good salary to be here. Legally, I know you don't have to incorporate any of our thoughts. You can just sit here and numb out. Once the environmental impact statement is collected with all of the input from this and from the EIS, legally that does not have to be incorporated into any decision making. So it's all a matter of trust that we're coming here tonight and sharing with you.

And I would like to read from — a quote from the Harvard Medical School director, John Mack: "We must seek to embrace the terror and experience its validity, for the immediacy of nuclear death is real. Only when we can honestly contemplate this horror, can we begin to master it. Until it does — we do that, it has us."

So I just would like to reemphasize the environmental justice concerns that Native Americans have endured numerous cancerous deaths due to their intake of fish with a high level of radioactivity. They have been the target, not only of that, but a lot of other degradations. They deserve to have a voice in this process.

I would also like to give my congratulations to the courage of the woman that spoke about her child, and I really hope — you know, she's left, and the other people that have probably left and the young teenager that left from here, I also have a grandfather who died early. He died of cancer. And we are now becoming more and more clear from the United States Government releasing, little bit by little bit, that radioactivity is correlated with cancer. So as was stated here a few times, I hope that message can get

incorporated into how we develop future solutions for cancer.

And I finally would just like to offer one more time a statement that's been said many times, that — please shut it down.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Kim, I'm going to stick you in the middle.

The lady in the blue there, yes.

STATEMENT OF KIRSTEN ELLSTROM

MS. KIRSTEN ELLSTROM: My name is Kirsten Ellstrom. I live in this country. I speak on behalf of my grandchildren.

There's been a lot of good specific details mentioned here tonight. I would like it to be on record that I strongly oppose the restart of this Hanford nuclear reactor.

I don't need to be a nuclear scientist to realize the problems that our nuclear facilities have caused, especially in this state. I don't think it was hard for DOE to find a doctor who was treating a lot of cancer patients in Richland; there has been a lot more cancer patients in that area than in other areas of this country.

I do believe that we do have to work for progress, and certainly I'm not even against

private enterprise. This young — or this older person for Slade Gorton has left by now. But DOE has been so incompetent and so dishonest with the people of the state of Washington for such a long time, that how naive do you expect us to be, to trust you again to do a good job?

I can understand that the people in that area would like an economic future, and I would again like Slade Gorton to provide more funds for cleanup in this area.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

Over here in the purple.

STATEMENT OF RUTH YARROW

MS. RUTH YARROW: My name is Ruth Yarrow. I'm a resident of Seattle, and I'm here to ask for a couple of things to be addressed in this PEIS.

One is that there is — there are one alternative of no action and four of -- four alternatives presented. None of those says clearly "Shut down, deactivate the FFTF reactor, period." We've heard a lot of testimony tonight why the different missions are not appropriate. I would like a single, simple alternative of just shutting down the FFTF.

You look as if you don't understand, Colette Brown. It's that all the other alternatives where it says to shut down the FFTF, it says, "and do space" — or "do research at another facility and produce plutonium-238 somewhere else." I'm saying, “Simply shut it down.”

THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

MS. RUTH YARROW: I say that because this whole PEIS starts out with an assumption that it is needed, new expanding emissions — missions for nuclear research and development. I'd like to see that clarified. I don't know what that means. I asked some of my congressional aides to look into it, and they were told — after repeated questions, didn't get any satisfaction, that they needed to have security clearance to find out more about this.

So it leads me to believe that this will eventually be tied to the stockpile stewardship program, to the 1997 Presidential directive which says, among other things, that the U.S. should continue developing nuclear capability. I'm calling for a halt to that.

To visualize what I think the danger of the FFTF is, right here and now, in calling away attention from the real process of cleanup, I've drawn a little picture for you tonight. The picture

shows the shape of the tanks in a different form.

And it doesn't show them underground, I grant you. But the other parts of this drawing are accurate. I've put in 177 tanks, I've showed a third of them leaking, and I have indicated that the contents is very long-lasting radioactive wastes. If you can think, for instance, in terms of plutonium-239 which didn't exist when I was born, and we now have over 900 metric tons of plutonium in different forms on the planet; this is — some of them lasting for 24,000 years half-life, what does that mean, 24,000 years? It's a thousand generations. That's been created in my lifetime, and didn't exist before.

So I'm going to ask my friend. Martin to help show this picture, and I'll have to turn it around both ways. Let's come up here first. Oh, that's good; we'll go around behind.

(Large drawing displayed.)

Okay, so these are the 177 tanks.

THE FACILITATOR: We've got to get you to a microphone.

MS. RUTH YARROW: Okay.

THE FACILITATOR: We can't hear you without it.

MS. RUTH YARROW: Okay. So we have 177 tanks here, a third of them leaking, containing

long-lived radioactive nuclear wastes. And the real danger is, it's saying, "Look! Quick, right here! Look at our clean, beautiful FFTF!" That's the danger, that we're taking away attention from the real problem of cleanup.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay, thank you.

Okay, it's about ten to 11:00, and moving ahead, I still see one, two — can I see the hands of how many people are still going to come, just so we can start — ten. Okay, so we have about ten or eleven people. And given five minutes for most, ten minutes maybe for a couple, we'll be an hour or so. So we'll plug ahead with no break, if that's okay, and we'll just keep going. If you have to hit the restroom, fine. And I'm going to come to the middle here. Right, the gray — thanks.

STATEMENT OF MANDY PUTNEY

MS. MANDY PUTNEY: My name's Mandy Putney. I live in Seattle. My comment has shortened considerably as I've listened to so many others.

I just wanted to share that I have spent a good deal of time in the past few weeks notifying people of this meeting, and I got two

consistent responses, the first one being "What meeting? We didn't know there was a meeting." And these were people that had attended previous meetings in the past, which leads me to believe that there was a severe lack of public notification about this meeting.

The second comment that was pretty consistent was, "How can it be that there's another plan, that there's another proposal to continue production of anything at Hanford?" I simply urge the DOE to listen to the people once and for all, not just document comments that are given tonight, but to truly listen to public outcry, and to take to heart that residents of Seattle and the Hanford area are tired of the waste and tired of the cleanup delays, and simply want it — want the reactor shut down, and want what's there cleaned up now.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

STATEMENT OF JOY GOLDSTEIN

MS. JOY GOLDSTEIN: My name is Joy Goldstein, and I'm from Vashon Island, and I'm here on my own behalf. I hadn't planned to say anything, but I sit here and I listen, and I listen, and I think I've found something that nobody's talked about yet.

On the handout about medical and industrial isotope production, Colette says that there's an anticipated increase in demand for medical and industrial isotopes, and in the next paragraph, "DOE encourages private sector investment in new isotope production ventures, and will sell or lease its existing facilities and inventories for commercial purposes." I'm not sure whether technically an EIS has to include that kind of information, but I would be very interested in knowing what kinds of inquiries and commitments DOE has received there.

Things like this, where the experts are saying two different kinds of things, I always want to know where the money is. And I really — you know.

How much of the task of cleanup can provide jobs for folks in the Tri-Cities areas if the Fast Flux Test Facility is shut down? How many of those people are convertible to other kinds of jobs? Because that is an issue. There are — there are people who work there, and that's their life, and I think we have to — we have to look at that.

But we also have to look at who thinks they're going to make a profit out of this, because it's taxpayers' money.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you.

Let's go to the gentleman here. We'll go to the center, stay there for a few minutes.

STATEMENT OF ERIC ESPENHORST

FRIENDS OF THE EARTH

MR. ERIC ESPENHORST: Thank you. My name is Eric Espenhorst, and I work for Friends of the Earth, which is a citizen-based environmental group that's at — I work in the Northwest office which has been in Seattle since 1971.

First I'd like to make a comment about how this meeting was run. All the other public hearings generally, you actually get to sign up, and it gives speakers a chance to know when they're going to talk. DOE has run it like that in the past. It eliminates this vague and somewhat rude pointing. I encourage you to go back to the sign-up process.

AUDIENCE MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. ERIC ESPENHORST: This is a good crowd.

Taking a step back, a professor of mine in graduate school used to start every lecture, so we might remember it, with — by pointing out

that many environmental issues are technically complicated and emotionally charged. And we've got that here in a big way. And the way that you, you know, don't stick your hand in that porcupine nest too much, is by building trust. So let's talk about trust.

The Tri-Party Agreement says that you will drain the sodium coolant out of Fast Flux by March 2000, and you'll have completed all activities necessary to achieve the end-point criteria by December 2001. Now, if you restart the Fast Flux, you're obviously not doing that. Now, if you can't — we can't trust you to agree to this document that a former DOE secretary -- I forget which one; they've got a shorter half-life than tritium -- signed, how can we trust you, period?

Now, you said, Colette, in the beginning, there are no guarantees. Well, I mean, you shouldn't be — you shouldn't be making that come true by doing it yourself. If we can't trust you on shutting down Fast Flux when you've said you will, I mean, what's the point? Okay, so we can't trust you.

This need for medical isotopes is based in part on a report from Frost and Sullivan.

Now, they assumed — this is great: an increase, a ten-fold increase in medical needs between the years 1996 and 2001. Over the past twenty years, demand has grown at 4 percent, and they assumed a 30 percent annual increase. Can't trust them.

It may cost around $250 million and take forty-two months to restart Fast Flux. That's according to DOE and the consulting firm you've hired, SAIC. Well, let's see. The last — which DOE facility should we compare this to? WPPSS? TVA? Synfuels? Uranium enrichment? All those have cost huge amounts more money, taken far more time to produce, to come to fruition, if they ever did. And with WPPSS, take your pick. Do you want the reactors that they never finished, that are costing us billions, or do you want the one which they did finish which operates about half the time, costs 50 percent more than market power? Well, can't trust them.

So what are we left with? We're left with a programmatic environmental impact statement, where I think in the optional restart of Fast Flux, before you make that decision you have to consider the effect on society when government says one thing and does 180 degrees opposite. We have elected

officials for that; we don't want that from the bureaucrats.

And I'll conclude on a note about the elected officials. You said that you're going to make the decision when you issue the final EIS sometime November/December 2000. Well, gee, there's an election in November of 2000. Are you going to -- is a lame-duck Secretary of Energy going to commit the next Administration to whatever? Doesn't the newly elected President have the prerogative of deciding this, which is -- you know, it's a big deal. It's not -- it's not the entire Federal budget or waging war, but it's a pretty big deal. Isn't — doesn't the newly elected President and his or her Secretary of Energy get to have some say over that, or is the lame duck going to be making the decision? Or has the decision really been made? Which I do believe it has, but you assured that it hasn't, so — thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thanks.

Yes.

STATEMENT OF ARTHUR ROLFE

MR. ARTHUR ROLFE: My name is Arthur Rolfe, and I'm a citizen of Bellevue.

THE FACILITATOR: Could we get that name again, sir? Could you give your name again, please? He didn't get it. Arthur, your name?

MR. ARTHUR ROLFE: Rolfe. Arthur Rolfe, R-o-l-f-e.

THE FACILITATOR: Thanks.

MR. ARTHUR ROLFE: Short and sweet, but they can't get it anyway.

I have very little to say, but I think it's acute, and it caps what has already been said tonight. I'm deeply disturbed by what I've heard and seen here tonight. The proposed restart of the Hanford Fast Flux Test Facility, the breeder reactor, literally sends chills down my spine. We have not in the past fifty-plus years found a way to safely dispose of very long-lived nuclear waste. Not one ounce. Yet we are smugly proposing to add to that waste despite the known catastrophic hazards to life. Incidentally, the nuclear waste generated by the very first reactor, Chicago University, is still with us.

The rationale for restart supports, at best, very short-term purported benefits, while continuing to increase the long-term hazards. The specters of Chernobyl, and currently Tokaimura, hang heavily over the proposed action.

The broken cleanup promises — the gentleman over here put it very well — and the diversion of cleanup funds are distressing omens regarding the integrity of future promises.

Remember, the touted benefits of the fast flux breeder reactor restart carry a price tag that is more than financial. What good are the short-term benefits if their price is poisoned water and atmosphere, the very stuff of life that we need to survive?

An example, already with us, is the ozone layer, the problem that in our arrogance and ignorance, we have created. Planet Earth is our one and only home. Why are we so ready to mess up the environment we need to sustain us?

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

Go to the — yes, sir.

STATEMENT OF MARTIN FLECK

MR. MARTIN FLECK: What can I add at such a late date? My name is Martin Fleck, F-l-e-c-k, and I want to say that I appreciate the stamina of everyone up here and everyone who has stayed this long and is going to hear what I have to say.

In the Vietnam War we got stuck in a bad situation, and I think one of the best analyses of how that happened was Daniel Ellsberg's. I read his book about *Papers on the War*, in which he described the quagmire myth and the stalemate machine. I don't know how many people here may have read that book, but briefly, briefly what it means is, there is a myth that we are stuck in a quagmire, but in fact, the United States policy was a stalemate machine. In other words, people knew that we were going to lose that war, but they could not let it happen under their watch. They could not have the United States lose a war like that, you know, "while my boss, the President of the United States, is in office." There's something really frighteningly familiar about coming back to these hearings over and over to talk about a proposal that is so unrealistic. It kind of reminds me of that situation, and it reminds me of that book. So you don't have to read the whole book, just dig it out: Daniel Ellsberg's *Papers on the War*. Just read the "Quagmire Myth and the Stalemate Machine," and see if it doesn't ring familiar to anybody who has been watching this FFTF process.

I know we're supposed to come in in a

scoping hearing like this on what ought to be included in the environmental impact statement. I personally think, especially having helped Ruth with her amazing graphic outlining — you know, helping us visualize what the real situation is at Hanford — I personally think that any environmental impact statement has to include -- any option that's considered has to include the complete plan for the full and effective cleanup of Hanford before the FFTF will be restarted. That's what I think should be in the scope of any plan that's considered because it is simply unreasonable to ask the citizens of this state to think about restarting anything at Hanford that would create more wastes.

I know that some of what happened here tonight probably seemed unreasonable, especially to the facilitator. Okay. But let me — let me make sure you understand the context, in case you haven't heard enough of it, which is that the people of this state have had a very unreasonable amount of risk laid on them, okay, in order to produce all these weapons at Hanford over all these years. And frankly, to consider an option that would restart a reactor at Hanford and say, "Don't worry folks; we're the scientists, we know what

we're doing, and it's going to be safe, and we know how to handle the wastes," is really insulting. And that's one reason why people get so unreasonable. They're tired of being insulted like that. It is an insult to our intelligence. Okay. And if you've studied what's happened at Hanford, you know that the citizens of this state have already paid the price, thank you very much. We have already paid the price of having a facility like this.

Ask anyone on the street who knows anything about Hanford, "Does it make sense to you that they ought to create more waste at Hanford?" We all know in this state — we all know what a travesty it has been. You know, all you have to do is read the newspaper, and it's full of stories about ridiculous episodes at Hanford. So it's just insulting to us, and I would ask you not to make us come back and comment on such an unreasonable proposal year after year in this stalemate machine. It would save us all a lot of problems.

And I work for Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility, and let me just add this, that as long as you want to play this game, we will come back and point out how ridiculous it is.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: In the suspenders — yeah.

STATEMENT OF RICHARD WAGNER

MR. RICHARD WAGNER: My name is Richard Wagner.

According to the Strategic Arms Limitations Talks, this country is supposed to be reducing its arsenal of nuclear weapons. Restart of the Fast Flux Test Facility would produce plutonium. Because the citizens — neither the citizens of this country or of any other country could verify what it was being used for, I believe this would make it a violation of the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks.

I don't — I heard on the news the other evening that the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty was not verified, and one of the arguments given for not verifying it was — voting for it, was that it was not verifiable, whereas in fact, it's been known for a long time that you can find — since the 1960s, you can detect nuclear explosions by seismic means, by satellite, and by radiation in either the upper atmosphere or the lower atmosphere when it eventually reaches there. I don't see how this sort of thing is going to contribute to the — because no one has oversight over what is being done — oh, I messed up.

But at any rate, because neither the citizens of this country or any other country can verify what's being done with the plutonium being produced by this facility, I believe it shouldn't be done at all.

THE FACILITATOR: I'm going back over here. The gentleman in the striped shirt back here — I'm sorry; there's sort of two striped shirts. The vertical striped shirts — you guys decided. It's late. You've been here this long; you deserve to decide. Okay. Okay, there you go. Go ahead.

STATEMENT OF CHRIS JACKINS

MR. CHRIS JACKINS: My name is Chris Jackins.

The FFTF reactor should not be used to produce plutonium-238. The focus should be on cleaning up Hanford's radioactive waste, not producing more waste.

At an earlier hearing I spoke against a previous proposal to us the FFTF reactor to produce tritium for fusion bombs. I would appreciate it if you could give me an early idea of what the next proposal might be.

I had some questions concerning

environmental impacts, six of them:

One, has this proposal been looked at taking into account any relevant information from the recent radioactive leak in Japan?

Two, has this proposal been looked at taking into account any relevant information from the recent NASA Mars orbiter problem with mixed measurements?

Three, has this proposal been looked at taking into account any relevant information regarding potential Year 2000 computer processing impacts?

Four, has this proposal been looked at as to impacts regarding any World Trade Organization agreements?

Five, has this proposal been looked at taking into account any modifications needed to safety measures made possible by a new plutonium detector developed at the Pacific Northwest National Laboratory in Richland? According to an article in the September 28th, 1999, *Seattle Times*, the plutonium detector, quote, "is so sensitive, it was recently triggered by a woman emitting gamma rays after receiving radiation therapy," unquote.

Number six, has this proposal been

looked at as to impacts regarding changes in the — changes to the handling of nuclear information? According to an article in the October 16th, 1999, *Seattle Times*, quote, "Energy Secretary Bill Richardson, under pressure from scientists and members of Congress, has sharply reduced the number of Federal employees who will be required to take polygraph examinations about their handling of nuclear secrets," unquote.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

Over here.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT KING

SIERRA CLUB, NORTHWEST CHAPTER

MR. ROBERT KING: Good evening. My name is Robert King. I'm representing myself and the Sierra Club, Northwest Chapter.

I'm going to give you a bit of a unique perspective, because I'm new to the city, and in mid-June my wife said, "Would you like to move to Seattle?" Our long-term goal was to eventually move out here, because the trees and the forest and the mountains makes a good combination.

And as I was involved with the Sierra Club, they mentioned if anybody has done any work on

radionuclides and the environment, and when I was doing some graduate work, I did a paper studying some aquatic toxicology. And there's very little scientific literature out there. Some of the stuff that I did come across were that, I think of five or six aquatic species, salmon seemed to be the most susceptible to radiation.

And as I was going home tonight, there was something that was bothering me as well, so then I went on to a Web site that I frequented — frequented when I was doing this research a couple of years ago. And I'll give you a little bit of history about Canada's nuclear industry. After the United States, Canada was the next power to have their own nuclear capabilities. In 1943, we started the research, and by 1945 we had our first operational research facility. And since then, I think we're on to our seventeenth research nuclear reactor.

And I know one of the prime product for Atomic Energy of Canada is to market medical isotopes. And it astounded me when I — when I read this press release issued by John Morrison. He's the president and CEO of MDS Nordion. They happen to be the largest world supplier of medical

isotopes. And I'll just give you quotation of what he said:

"Indeed, MDS Nordion supplies two-thirds of the world's moly-99, an impressive amount, underlying the importance of Canada's nuclear industry for health and well-being of people here and beyond our borders. We," and that means Canada, "are the world's number one producer of medical isotopes. It's a serious responsibility, and we have to be absolutely reliable. We ship product almost every day to the U.S., to Europe, Japan, and elsewhere. And of course, these products with short half-lives cannot be stockpiled."

And then I found out that Atomic Energy of Canada is planning to build two more research reactors that are — that go specifically for medical isotopes. So if we're going to have two more, why do we have to start the one at Hanford again?

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you.

Okay, yes, let's go back here, stay on this side. Yes, sir?

STATEMENT OF DONALD E. SANDBERG

MR. DONALD SANDBERG: Good evening. My name is Don Sandberg. I live in Pasco, Washington.

As many of you know, I've spent a great deal of time in the past six years working on environmental impact statements. With this experience and what's happened in the last ten months, I want to give you a different slant on the scope of this PEIS.

Throughout these scoping hearings, many people will present a variety of statistics, usually very large or very small numbers, to support their contention about what should or shouldn't be within the scope of the PEIS, and what the Department of Energy should or should not do. I want to begin by giving you a perspective that is primarily based on a statistic of one.

This morning I went to the University of Washington Medical Center, where I had a catheter implanted in my chest. By noon, I was at the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center having stem cells harvested from my blood. The purpose of the catheter is to allow my blood to be taken out, the stem cells removed, and the blood returned. The process took about three hours. I will go through the same process again tomorrow and perhaps on Wednesday. You see, I have non-Hodgkin's lymphoma.

That's cancer of the lymphatic system. Since January, I've gone through a first series of chemotherapy, consisting of six treatments over a four and one half month period. This is typically very effective, but I began to show the return of the cancer after a few weeks. I have since had three treatments of a second, more extensive set of chemotherapy.

Although I have responded very well, the statistics over many years and many patients have shown that more is required for a potential cure. So on November the 2nd, I will enter the UW Medical Center to undergo high-dose treatment and a bone marrow transplant. The stem cells will allow me to be my own donor for the transplant. I will be in the hospital for about forty days, with full recovery to take as long as six months.

What does all this have to do with the scope of the PEIS? Well, many of you will not be surprised to know that medical isotopes have played a part in all this. In fact, I might not be alive today without a diagnostic procedure using a medical isotope which was performed after I entered the hospital emergency room in January, bleeding to death. For those who think I might be exaggerating,

I received twelve units of blood that day between 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. If you don't know the significance of that, there's enough doctors around here who will tell you that. The bleeding was the result of the damage caused by the lymphoma. And now, the use of a new treatment involving a medical isotope may be my only chance for continued survival if my upcoming treatment and transplant are not successful. So I'm standing here to tell you that medical isotope production is about a lot more than a statistic of one, and that it absolutely does belong in the scope of this PEIS.

Further, I think that the operation of the FFTF to produce medical isotopes should be a national imperative. The United States is the richest nation on earth. As such, if it does not seize this opportunity to advance medical science for all of humankind, the U.S. will be morally derelict.

There are those that will tell you that operating FFTF to produce medical isotopes is an invitation to death, this based on the one-in-a-million chance that a member of the public might get a latent cancer. You knew I couldn't do this without some statistics. The fact is, the chances

are one in three or higher, right now, for everyone in this room. So to everyone, if it's not you, it may be one of the people on either side of you, or one of your family, or perhaps one of your neighbors. When this does happen, it is my hope that the doctors will have a greatly improved set of options to provide a cure.

By the way, I've only talked to you about the relationship between medical isotopes and cancer because I'm understandably focused on that. However, cancer is only part of the story because medical isotopes can and are being used for a greater variety of diagnostic and treatment procedures for many diseases. I prefer to leave those stories to others more qualified.

One last thought, this about the potentially lethal radiation exposure that a member of the public can get from FFTF. As you well know, the amount is more than a million times smaller than the radiation each of us gets every year. That is natural background. By comparison, during my first four days in the hospital in November, I will receive 500 million times more radiation than that member of the public would get in a year. And this is to improve my statistics to something better than

the one-in-a-million chance of living if I did nothing. You can see why I'm adamant about a future that includes the healing that the radiation from medical isotopes can do.

Thank you for the opportunity to present this information.

THE FACILITATOR: Thanks.

Okay, moving forward – can I just say, I know this may be hard to even get your hands up at this late hour. How many more people would like to comment? Three over here. Is that it? Well, let's start. Ma'am, go ahead. Go ahead, yes. Yes.

STATEMENT OF NANCY DICKEMAN

MS. NANCY DICKEMAN: My name is Nancy Dickeman.

THE FACILITATOR: Try to – there you go.

MS. NANCY DICKEMAN: Thanks. My name is Nancy Dickeman. I oppose the restart of the FFTF reactor, and I'm especially concerned regarding proposals for use for production purposes outside the scope of its design. The ramifications of producing plutonium at this reactor may be far greater than any currently foreseen, in perhaps the

same way that the magnitude of the storage and disposal of radioactive waste was not foreseen during previous production periods.

I grew up in Richland, where I stood in the shadow of the reactors and swam in the Columbia. I didn't know then what the river held, what was borne on the wind that pelted our faces with sand, what the air carried hundreds of miles away. The land is stained with wildflowers and sagebrush, with the river's blue thread, and with the radioactive materials that may invisibly alter what they touch. It is already burdened with the refuse of our work, with the work that forged ahead despite the questions that lay in our hands.

Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

Okay, I think we have two more. Is that right? Okay. I saw one hand. Gerry, are you going to — okay, good.

(Audience member carrying phonograph recordings to the podium.)

I see an 11:20 musical interlude, right?

MR. DANA LYONS: The mike's taped.

THE FACILITATOR: Not intentionally.

MR. DANA LYONS: That's fine.

THE FACILITATOR: There you go.

STATEMENT OF DANA LYONS

SAFE BELLINGHAM

MR. DANA LYONS: Hi. First of all, my prayers for your speedy healing. Good luck. My mother had the Hodgkin's lymphoma also, and she's a survivor, and may you pull through quickly.

My name is Dana Lyons. I'm from Bellingham. I'm here representing Safe Bellingham, which is a citizens action group for safe pipelines. I'm going to say a few comments, then I'm going to sing my tune.

My neighborhood blew up. I was there two blocks away from it; my house — parents' house is right next to the park. The explosion happened because a corrupt Federal agency was not following the law. And with all due respect to our representatives of the Department of Energy, that is honestly what the majority of the people in Washington state feel about the Department of Energy. They feel like it's a corrupt, inept organization. And I don't mean to say that you are either of those things. I know that you're here

because one of your bosses needed to get back at you for something.

But I've actually had the opportunity to talk with a number of people who are here with the Department of Energy and workers from Hanford, and some people have said, you know, "We don't take this personally." But I want to say that I take it very personally. I mean, I saw -- I saw that mushroom cloud. I wondered how many of my neighbors were dead. And I realized that this could happen at Hanford, and it's — well, we've been through it. It's the —

I wanted to -- as a token of appreciation to the many hard-working people tonight, I want to give you a copy of this album, "Our state is a dump site." Actually, it's an official state song in the state songbook. And I was always afraid that the half-life of this song may be 250,000 years, and it seems to be going that way, but I'm going to — I have a few copies, and I have one for the sound man over there who's been working very hard all night. I have one for the hardest working person, the clerk, one for you, and a couple for the representatives who are listening to us.

Before I sing, I have a little bit of constructive criticism, especially for the facilitator. And I'm sorry; I forget your name.

THE FACILITATOR: It's not important.

MR. DANA LYONS: All right. At the beginning of the evening, you were talking about you're nonbiased, you wanted to be fair. Okay. If you want to be fair and you want the people to make an educated decision, in any debate forum you have experts from both sides make their case, and one side can pick their experts and the other side can pick their experts. You are a talented moderator, but you're being -- if you allow yourself to continue in this format throughout this tour, you're going to be allowing yourself to be used as a tool by the Department of Energy. And I think you need to think about that, and I think that you and the Department of Energy needs to take a hard look at what are you really trying to achieve here.

And the reason that I believe the Department of Energy didn't want experts from the anti-FFTF — I don't even know all the — to speak, is because that's when first — that is when the media is here. They didn't want the message to get out. They didn't want — we have so many excellent

activists and speakers here, experts who have been studying this for decades. The Department of Energy didn't want their message on the news, and they knew that if they waited long enough and had the moderator choose — and the moderator has a sense of the way we dress, as to who is who. They knew that by the time the experts spoke, they wouldn't get on the news. So I would encourage you in the future to make that change. That's a constructive criticism.

The last record I have before I sing the song — we're late in the program; I'm dragging on. I'm representing a group; that means I got ten minutes, right? I would like to present — there's many people here who should be honored. And incidentally, I do have free records for everybody, to be nonbiased, so I won't leave anyone out here. They're in back. You just have to have a turntable, right.

THE FACILITATOR: Yes, we still have vinyl, yeah.

MR. DANA LYONS: Many people here who should be honored; I'd like to just take the opportunity to honor one person, and actually, coincidentally, it happens to be the next person, I

believe, who is going to testify. I'd like to honor Gerry Pollet, with Heart of America Northwest.

Gerry has taken on the amazingly difficult job of being the citizen watchdog person of Hanford, the largest nuclear waste facility in the world. Gerry has done so much for us, and I really appreciate it. I really appreciate it, because, man, it is a tough job. You're fighting against the largest budget in the United States Government, virtually. You know, what is it, DOD/DOE? And I thank you for your work, Gerry.

Gerry wrote, or was instrumental in the writing of Referendum 84 — or was it 48? I don't remember — back in 1986, when the Department of Energy wanted to put the commercial nuclear waste dump in our state. They figured, "Oh, they got so much of it, let's dump even more there." They thought they could run it by us. But they didn't. We created an initiative or a referendum, and we defeated it by 84 percent Referendum 40. Eighty-four percent of Washington state voted against that dump.

Well, if you want to push this through and you want to take on people like me who aren't going to stand for any more explosions near

my friends or neighbors or family, I take it personally. If you want to deal with more people like me, and if you want to make us run a whole initiative process so we can beat you again by more than 84 percent, go ahead. Because I'm going to tell you right now that I am not going to allow it, and you're going to lose. You're going to lose. The reactor is never going to open again, so you might as well get used to it. Take that message back to D.C. Take it back to the Tri-Cities. It's over. We are not going to stand for it.

The Department of Energy and Hanford has no credibility here. And I've got a lot of friends from the Tri-Cities, and they worked very hard to keep that place safe. Unfortunately, our government is overrun by corporate influence, and our agencies are corrupt. Okay, now I've got that off my chest.

THE FACILITATOR: You have two minutes.

MR. DANA LYONS: Two minutes.

THE FACILITATOR: So I don't know how long "Toxic Waste Dump" is, but —

MR. DANA LYONS: That's okay.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

MR. DANA LYONS: Now to follow up upsettedness with humor here [*singing*]:

"Well, I lost my job here fishin' and opened up a store. I buy and sell reactors, cooling towers and lead doors. We've got a brand-new industry bearing fruit of finer taste. We sell juice to California and get paid to keep the waste.

"Our state is a dump site, plutonium-239. Our state is a dump site — just set it over there, that's fine. Our state is a dump site; we'll take whatever you send. Our state is a dump site where the hot times never end.

"We don't just make the power, we also build the bombs. The dollars never stop from Washington to Washington. The other states all love us 'cause we rarely take a stand. They send us little presents and put money in our hands."

Everybody now.

"Our state is a dump site, plutonium-239. Our state is a dump site — just set it over there, that's great."

You're not singing, Colette. This is — we're coming up to the harmony part here.

"Our state is a dump site; we'll take whatever you send. Our state is a dump site where the hot times never end."

Now, there's only one more chorus to get your harmonies on, so —

"So now I'm big and wealthy 'cause my business here has grown. I sell lamps that don't plug in and heaters for your home. Progress and technology, for us they're sure been great. We're singing here in Washington, the Ever-Glowing state.

"Our state is a dump site, plutonium-238. Our state is a dump site — just set it over there, that's great. Our state is a dump site; we'll take whatever you send. Our state is a dump site where the hot times never end."

One more time, now.

"Our state is a dump site, plutonium-238. Our state is a dump site — just set it over there, that's great. Our state is a dump site; our fate is to mutate. We're singing here in Washington, the Ever-Glowing state."

Grab harmony, everybody.

"We're singing here in Washington, the Ever-Glowing state."

THE FACILITATOR: And exactly ten minutes. Okay.

Okay, additional speakers at this point?

MR. GERRY POLLET: I've been told I don't sing. I've been told that a lot of times, and there's a reason for that, and I'm not going to sing solo.

STATEMENT OF GERRY POLLET

HEART OF AMERICA NORTHWEST

MR. GERRY POLLET: I'd like to talk, wrap this up tonight, about commitments. I'll get to give technical testimony tomorrow night in Portland on behalf of Heart of America Northwest.

For the record, Heart of America Northwest, Gerald Pollet.

There are seven commitments that I'd like to talk about. The first commitment is the one of the Secretary of Energy to openness and public involvement. Bill Richardson has said — and I have known him when he was in Congress — he has a deep commitment to openness and public involvement, and he has repeatedly said he wants notice in such a manner that it actually tells people how the Department of Energy's decisions may impact their values and lives. We didn't have that for these hearings tonight and the ones upcoming around the region, and I'm greatly disappointed. The people, the 1,200 people who turned out to hearings here in

Seattle, Portland, Hood River, and Tri-Cities, who opposed FFTF in January/February of 1998, did not receive a mailing.

Over forty people who commented in 1998 at public hearings in Seattle were told that their comments were lost because they commented on FFTF. Those people who did comment on FFTF in January and February of 1998, the majority of them were told their comments did not count.

Normally, the public in this region is expecting that they will hear an alternative viewpoint because the Hanford cleanup agreement, as a matter of law, now requires that for any decision involving public meetings that will impact the cleanup agreement, there must be an alternative point of view presented. Now, you're not familiar with that, apparently, but Richland could have told you that's the case, or the State of Washington or U.S. EPA or the State of Oregon. I know that you were called by a Hanford Public Interest Network Group representative, and maybe you just don't trust us.

But it would have gone a long way towards smoothing things over to run this like we run most hearings out here because we've taken some

significant steps with the Hanford site when it comes to public involvement and making sure that we have adequate notice. And adequate notice includes, when you get to the meeting, knowing what are the differing points of view.

Now, another problem tonight was talked about, a sign-up list. People came from ninety miles away, they came early because they were told in the *Federal Register* notice that there was a sign-up list. It said, "Arrive at 6:00 for registration," which usually means "sign-up list." That's what it usually means. You're saying, “No?” That's what people expect if they see something that says, "6:00 o'clock registration."

With all due respect, people feel that — obviously, that someone who's paid by the Department of Energy to be a moderator, Jim, is going to — no matter how fair you are, is going to be picking, calling based on who called the shots for him. And so the answer here is to try to work with the way we've done things in the region. And we have made significant strides for public involvement.

In terms of commitments, we are asking that all the comments from the January and

February 1998 records — hearings, and the comments sent to the Secretary and the Department at that time be entered into this record and responded to in regard to the scope of the EIS because of the issues raised in those hearings. And because you did not contact those people, that is the fair and reasonable thing to do because you did not contact them.

You ran one ad that — in the *Seattle Times*, that ran on the page after the obituaries. It did not provide meaningful notice. It didn't say, "Here is what the decision may mean to you." It was about 30 percent of the size of the ads required for the Hanford cleanup agreement.

Now, we'd also like to make sure that you mail this time — next time when you come out on your draft environmental impact statement, you mail a notice to all the people who do show up here tonight and the next three nights, as well as all the people who you missed and didn't mail to, who are on your records as the Department of Energy in the Office of Nuclear Energy, in terms of the January and February 1998 hearings. You've got those names, so you can use them.

Other -- what are the commitments

being broken? Let's start with number one. The Secretary of Energy, December 1996, made a formal commitment to the public in the Northwest and to Congress, and the Secretary of Energy less than three years ago said that within five years, by 2001, all of the Department of Energy's nuclear energy research and processing facilities would be subject to full and complete external nuclear safety regulation.

Don't hear much about that these days; it's one of those broken commitments that had a half-life much shorter than tritium.

We believe that the Department of Energy, as a matter of law, must consider, as a reasonable alternative in this PEIS, meeting the formal commitment of the Department to subject its facilities, including the FFTF, and all processing facilities, including the fuel fabrication, target separation processing, and plutonium processing processes and facilities, to independent nuclear safety regulation.

Why would this make a difference? Well, the Department of Energy, it turns out, has its own standards for how much radiation is an allowable dose, an acceptable dose in the event of

an accident, to the public. And it's a hell of a lot more than the NRC or EPA allow. It's a hell of a lot more than the public thinks is acceptable. In fact, the Department of Energy believes that it's acceptable, under its guidelines, under normal operations, for the Hanford site to give a dose of radiation that is far greater than the NRC and EPA allow to members of the public.

Another example would be the Department of Energy, under its self-regulation, which is not real regulation at all — it determines things like when is the secondary sodium coolant loop for FFTF considered radioactive, and when is it called nonradioactive. Of course, tritium and plutonium do migrate across from the primary loop to the secondary loop. But the Department of Energy's materials call the secondary loop nonradioactive. It's because they adopted a definition that says, "As long as it's below this level, it's nonradioactive, and we set that level after determining from operating history that we shouldn't reach that level." But it is radioactive.

The second commitment — excuse me. A second relationship would be, Who does this environmental impact statement? In fact, a DOE

contractor wouldn't be doing this. A contractor who works for the agency that says, "No high-level nuclear waste tanks have leaked at Hanford since 1992," would not be doing this environmental impact statement, but an independent regulator would be.

The second commitment is the Tri-Party Agreement. In 1995, the Department of Energy said it will shut down the FFTF reactor —

THE FACILITATOR: Thirty seconds.

MR. GERRY POLLET: — and use, and I quote, "the funds saved for higher priority environmental management activities." That would mean 30 to 40 million dollars a year would be going into meeting your unfunded legal obligations under the Hanford cleanup agreement. That's more money than you will be spending this year on actual remediation of groundwater along the Columbia River. That's more money, by several times, than you will spend cleaning up your buried transuranic waste at Hanford, which you're breaking your obligations on.

THE FACILITATOR: It's ten minutes, Gerry.

MR. GERRY POLLET: Okay, I'll just wrap up here.

We believe that, as a matter of law, you must consider in this environmental impact statement as a reasonable alternative, and under the impacts of your proposed action, you must consider and disclose what would be impacted, and the benefits if you shut down the reactor and met your commitment to use the funds saved for, quote, "higher priority environmental management activities," unquote.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

MR. GERRY POLLET: I'm going to wrap up with this: to meet the law, the National Environmental Policy Act, we should first be deciding what is the need for these missions and the structure of the Department's infrastructure in order to meet those needs. Is there a need for medical isotopes? Can we rely on Canada? Can we build a high-neutron-flux accelerator? Can we use university accelerators and facilities? That is the proper thing to do.

And I want to appreciate that, after corresponding with you, you did indeed change from the proponents' insistence that there just be a site-specific EIS, to going to a programmatic environmental impact statement, made a very

significant change there, and we appreciate your listening to us, or determining on your own that you did it.

But still, before you do this, right now you are independently doing a nuclear science and technology long-range research and development plan, a nuclear science and technology infrastructure road map, nonproliferation studies and cost studies —

THE FACILITATOR: Two minutes over.

MR. GERRY POLLET: — and you are not going to incorporate those things into this PEIS. And the law requires that you incorporate them into the programmatic environmental impact statement up front, and you defer any site-specific work until after you have issued a programmatic environmental impact statement.

I think it is a travesty that, while you are saying you're doing a programmatic environmental impact statement, you cling to the site-specific here, and in the Notice of Intent said, "The PEIS will include sufficient project-specific analysis of the FFTF to enable DOE to support a restart decision." It's an invitation to a lawsuit, and we got it coming because you can't do

that while claiming that "We're doing a PEIS, but we're going to look at just this one site specifically before we even do our infrastructure road map."

THE FACILITATOR: Gerry, it's going to have to shut off.

MR. GERALD POLLET: Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Thank you.

I want to check and see if there's any additional comments from anybody else. I'm going to check. I'm checking to see if there's anybody that hasn't gone yet. No one at this time.

I'm sorry? You have a —

STATEMENT OF AN AUDIENCE MEMBER

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'll be very quick. It's a quarter till 12:00; we've been going at this for close to five hours. Have you ever been to a movie that was five hours long? They don't make five-hour movies because they want you to come and they want your business. When I go to Safeway, where they want my business, they have eighteen check stands to make sure that I can be taken care of quickly. The Department of Energy should be holding meetings on multiple nights. This was not just a public hearing, it was also a public shutout,

because a lot of people who would have testified didn't have the *sitzfleisch* to stay until they could finally get called on.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: You need to hold multiple evenings, or rent two rooms and hold simultaneous hearings, so that you can hear the public. Thank you.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay. Thank you.

If I saw no other hands, this means we're adjourned. Thank you for coming and sticking out through the bitter – the end here. Thank you.

MR. GERRY POLLET: I'd like give for the record the report of the Hanford Public Interest Network, August 1999, which we'd like responded to in the EIS.

THE FACILITATOR: Okay.

(Whereupon, at 11:45 p.m. the meeting was concluded)

C E R T I F I C A T E

We hereby certify that this is the transcript of the public meeting called by the Department of Energy concerning its

NUCLEAR INFRASTRUCTURE
PROGRAMMATIC ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

held on Monday, October 18, 1999, in Seattle, Washington, and that this is a full and correct transcription of the proceedings.

_____
Karl Fuss, Reporter

_____
William Wagner, Transcriber